1c1

Presented to
Bonebrake
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Reverend
W. R. Livingstone

W. R. Livingston

Richard T. Ely's Works.

The Labor Movement in America $1.50
Taxation in American States and Cities . . . 1.75
Problems of To-day 1.50
Social Aspects of Christianity 90
Socialism and Social Reform 1.50

T. Y. CROWELL & CO., New York.

French and German Socialism in Modern Times, .75

HARPER & BROS., New York.

An Introduction to Political Economy 1.00
Outlines of Economics (College Edition) . . 1.25

HUNT & EATON, New York.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY,

AND OTHER ESSAYS.

BY

RICHARD T. ELY, PH.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND DIRECTOR OF THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY, IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
HN
31
.E57
1889
5,946

NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION.

(*Eleventh Thousand.*)

NEW YORK
THOMAS Y. CROWELL & COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

Copyright,
BY THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.
1889.

TYPOGRAPHY BY J. S. CUSHING & CO., BOSTON.

TO

MY FRIENDS

PRESIDENT EDWARD OLSON,

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF DAKOTA,

AND

PROFESSOR WILLIAM R. HARPER,

OF

YALE UNIVERSITY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. Social Aspects of Christianity 1

i. Statement of Fundamental Principles . . . 1

ii. Statement of Fundamental Principles Concluded 10

iii. The Simple Gospel of Christ 19

iv. The Christian in the World, but not of the World 30

v. The Alienation of Wage-Workers from the Church 39

II. The Church and the World 49

III. Philanthropy 83

IV. Ethics and Economics 113

V. The Social Crisis and the Church's Opportunity 133

PREFACE.

ALL of these essays, except the second, have already appeared in print, and a word with reference to each of them may not be out of place.

The first essay, which gives the title to this little volume, was originally a lay sermon, preached in the Presbyterian Church, in Fredonia, N.Y. Subsequently it was enlarged and published as a series of five articles in the *Congregationalist* of Boston.

The second essay was originally an address, delivered before the Baptist Ministers of New York, at one of their usual Monday gatherings.

The third essay consists of two parts. The first appeared in the magazine the *Chautauquan*, and was part of an article bearing the same title. The second part — with the introductory remark — was written for the *Baltimore Sun* at the solicitation of the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore, and by that Society reprinted in the form of a pamphlet. A special edition was printed for the New York Charity Organization Society.

The fourth essay appeared in the weekly journal *Science*, and was reprinted as one of a series of

essays in the little volume called "Science Economic Discussion."

All of these essays have been revised and considerably changed — chiefly in the way of enlargement — for this volume.

The essays were prepared for different audiences, and it is natural that there should be some repetition, as they were written without thought of future publication as a collection of essays. I do not know, however, that I regret this. It may be well to approach the same thoughts from different standpoints, and to get a clearer comprehension of their full significance than would otherwise be possible.

My thanks are due to those who have given me permission to reprint the essays.

RICHARD T. ELY.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Baltimore, August, 1889.

I.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

I.

STATEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

"*But when the Pharisees had heard that He had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together.*

"*Then one of them which was a lawyer, asked Him a question, tempting Him, and saying,*

"*Master, which is the great commandment in the law?*

"*Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.*

"*This is the first and great commandment.*

"*And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

"*On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*" (St. Matt. xxii. 34–40.)

This is a most remarkable, and at the same time a most daring, summary of the whole duty of man. A human teacher would never have ventured to reduce all God's commandments to two simple statements; nor would such a teacher have

presumed to exalt man's obligation to love and serve his fellows to an equal plane with his obligations to love his Creator. All other religious systems will be searched in vain for such a classification of human duties. The first and great commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," does not strike us as strange. It is natural that the Supreme Being of the universe should require of us, His creatures, an unconditional and unlimited homage; but — listen! — The second commandment is like unto it — is like unto it — of the same nature: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself — and — on these two commandments — on these two equally — hang all the law and the prophets.

But John, the beloved apostle, the apostle of love, — and, as God is love, we may suppose that he understood better than others the nature of Christ, — is very bold in his exposition of our duty to love our fellows, making that a test of one's love to God. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" And in another verse in the same chapter of his Epistle, John says, "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because — because — we love the brethren." St. Paul, indeed, goes so far as to say, "For all the law is fulfilled, even in this: Thou

shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Gal. v. 14.) St. Paul evidently felt that love to neighbor carried with it love to God.

Christ, himself, has told us the method by which he will at the last Judgment separate the sheep from the goats. Listen to his words, which must be quoted in full, and every word should receive careful attention:

"*When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory:*

"*And before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats:*

"*And He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on His left.*

"*Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:*

"*For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in;*

"*Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.*

"*Then shall the righteous answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, and fed Thee? or, thirsty, and gave Thee drink?*

"*When saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in? naked, and clothed Thee?*

"*Or, when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee?*

"*And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*

"*Then shall He say also unto them on His left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;*

"*For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:*

"*I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.*

"*Then shall they also answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto Thee?*

"*Then shall He answer to them, saying, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as you did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.*

"*And those shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.*" (St. Matt. xxv. 31–46.)

The minds of readers have been so generally absorbed by the awful punishment meted out to the wicked, that terror has not allowed them to notice what is the most marked feature in the narrative; namely, the exquisite beauty of the humanitarianism which it breathes. It is the Gospel of

Humanity, because it is the gospel of the Son of man.

The marks of distinction are perceived. They are not regular attendance at church — not sound notions in regard to the form of baptism or methods of ordination, or apostolic succession, or the nature of the Lord's Supper, or Church organization — not any notions, whatever, as regards the future life — not any subjective feelings in regard to God. These are all, doubtless, important; but these are not the distinctive things by which Christ separates the good from the bad. The performance or non-performance of social duties in the gospel narrative separates the doomed from the blessed: "I was in prison, and ye visited me," etc.

I say this is something new in religious systems. All false systems of religion exalt the love of God above the love due our fellow-men, and tell us that we may serve God by injuring our fellows. How many millions of human beings have thought that they did God service by human sacrifice! Not only is this true, but it is furthermore true that, in proportion as believers in the true religion depart from the mind which was in Jesus Christ, they neglect the second commandment. Thus, when Christ dwelt on earth, He found men excusing themselves from duty to their fellows on the plea of higher obligation to Deity. The reader will recall at once one instance. Moses commanded men to honor their fathers and mothers,

and included, as a matter of course, the maintenance of father or mother in case of need; but the Hebrew theologians said a man could exempt himself from his duty to support his parents by consecrating his goods to the Lord. "But, ye say" — thus Christ addressed the scribes and Pharisees — "if a man shall say to his father or mother, It is corban, that is to say, a gift (devoted to God), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me (by which I might support thee), he shall be free.

"And ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or mother." But Christ added, "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition," and He upbraided them by addressing them as "Ye hypocrites."

Nothing is more difficult, nothing more requires divine grace, than the constant manifestation of love to our fellows in all our daily acts, in our buying, selling, getting gain. People still want to substitute all sorts of beliefs and observances in the place of this, for it implies a totally different purpose from that which animates this world. It is when men attempt to regulate their lives seven days in the week by the Golden Rule that they begin to perceive that they cannot serve God and mammon; for the ruling motive of the one service — egotism, selfishness — is the opposite of the ruling motive of the other — altruism, devotion to others, consecration of heart, soul, and intellect

to the service of others. Men are still quite willing to make long prayers on Sunday, if on week days they may devour widows' houses; or, as Rev. Mark Guy Pearse said two summers since at Chautauqua, they are ready to offer their prayers and their praise on Sunday, if on Monday they may go into the market place and skin their fellows and sell their hides.

The second commandment, which is like the first, means that in every act and thought and purpose, in our laws and in their administration, in all public as well as private affairs, we — if indeed we profess to be Christians — should seek to confer true benefits upon our fellow-men. It means that the man who professes to love God and who attempts to deceive others in regard to the real value of railway stock, or, for that matter, any other property, that he may coax their money into his pockets, is a hypocrite and a liar. It means that the man who oppresses the hireling in his wages is no Christian, but a pagan, whatever may be his declarations to the contrary notwithstanding. What does God say of such an one? He says: "I will be a swift witness against those that oppress the hireling in his wages." What does His second commandment mean for those rich men who keep back the hire of their laborers? It means that they "must" weep and howl "for the miseries that shall come upon them." And what does this message mean for monopolists who

use their superior advantages of wealth or intellect, or bodily strength or other resources, to crowd out and grind down their fellows according to the methods of modern commercial competition? The prophet Isaiah shall tell us: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth."

It is needless to enlarge upon this. It must be seen that the arrangements of this world are not in accord with the commandment given to love our neighbor as ourselves. These words may be found in writings previous to Christ, but never before His time had there been a serious attempt to carry this teaching into all the relations of life with all men. Thus it was a true word when Christ said to His disciples: "A *new* commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

It is indeed a strange conception that some people have of the gospel of Christ. That gospel which in its highest unity is Love is divided into two parts: the first is theology, the second is sociology— the science of society.

"Theology treats of God and His relations to His creatures, and of the existence, character, and attributes of God, His laws and government, the doctrines we are to believe and the duties we are to practice." Such is the definition of theology found in Webster's dictionary. The first words

are sufficient. Theology "is the science of God and His relations to His creatures." But the whole science is simply an elaboration of the first of the two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets. It is a proper study for man; especially is it a fitting study for those who are called to serve as ministers in God's church. We all know with what assiduity the study of theology has been pursued. Men of great intellect have by the thousand devoted their entire lives to it, and every clergyman is expected to prepare himself for his sacred office by a training in a theological seminary for several years. This is well so far as it goes. This ought not to be left undone, but this is not enough. What has the Church done with the second commandment, which, in its elaboration, becomes social science or sociology?

II.

STATEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES CONCLUDED.

THE question was asked at the close of the last paragraph. What has the Church done in the way of careful research in social science? It is necessary to reply that she has done comparatively little, and next to nothing since the Protestant Reformation. It is necessary to offer a word of explanation. In the earlier ages of the Church social science was cultivated to a greater or less extent by theologians, and there is much in their writings of which note must be taken in any history of that part of social science called political economy. This is particularly the case, it needs scarcely to be said, with the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Now in later centuries it is doubtless true that the greatest and best thoughts in social science may be traced very generally to Christian inspiration, but they have been an indirect rather than a direct outgrowth of the life of the Church. Yet as this social science, which deals with the relation of man to his fellows in what we call society, has for its special province human happiness and well-

being, and the underlying conditions of a prosperous, righteous, and progressive state of society, it might naturally be supposed that such a science, above all others, would absorb the attention of men seeking to obey Christ's new commandment to love one another, and to promote the true welfare of their neighbors in all those infinite ways which love suggests.

The Church has, in recent years, for the most part, contented herself with repeating platitudes and vague generalities which have disturbed no guilty soul, and thus she has allowed the leadership in social science to slip away from her. It can, then, scarcely excite surprise that communism has become infidel, and socialism materialistic. Has she not, indeed, without any careful examination of their claims, hastened to condemn them to please the rich?

The wrong of this is not connected with the fact that socialism and communism are not practicable theories for modern industrial society. It was not a deep penetration into the principles of social science which led the Church to take this stand, but subserviency to the powers of this world. I suppose there is nothing which causes the worldly-minded among professing Christians such uneasiness as the narrative of the rich young man who turned away in sorrow when told to sell all that he had and to give to the poor, and those verses in the Acts of the Apostles which tell the

simple story of the communism, founded in love, which prevailed among the early Christians.

But do not our fashionable pastors hasten to tell us first that Christ did not really mean the young man to give up his property, but only wanted to try him, which from the context and the nature of the case is a manifest absurdity; second, that this communism of the Christians at Jerusalem was a lamentable failure, which explains their subsequent poverty? I am sure I have frequently seen such statements, and I know with what eagerness these comforting words are received into willing ears; but I know not of the slightest historical foundation for this alleged connection between the communism of the Christians and their poverty, while there is, indeed, reason to attribute it to other causes. Still less can it be claimed that there is any such necessary connection when in the United States we have a single communistic settlement whose property is valued at ten millions of dollars, and several which are in a really prosperous condition.

The ministers of the Church repeat often enough the words of the Golden Rule; but the question arises, How am I to show my love for my fellowmen? How am I to go to work to elevate them, to make them both happier and better? How am I, as a follower of Christ, to conduct myself in the industrial world? What are my duties as employer, as landlord or tenant, as creditor or

debtor? What position should I take on the land question, on the subject of labor organization, and the other aspects of the great labor problems? What force have the regulations of the Old Testament concerning business for me now? What about such a matter as interest on money? To take usury — which, as every one knows, in the Bible means simply interest, not excessive interest as now, but any interest at all — seems to be regarded as a great sin. It was forbidden the Israelites in their dealings with one another; and in case of poverty, it was forbidden to take interest even of strangers. In Lev. xxv. 35–37, we read as follows:

"*And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee.*

"*Take thou no usury of him, or increase, but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee.*

"*Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.*"

And the Psalmist answers his own question, "Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle, who shall dwell in Thy holy hill?" with the words, "He that putteth not out his money to usury."

It was, moreover, long forbidden members of the Christian Church to take any interest on money lent; and, while the Church is silent now, the laws of many of our States at least limit the

rate of interest. Now I do not propose to discuss exhaustively this question of interest, which would require too much space. I simply mention it as one of those questions which a Christian man ought to consider, and which ought not to be ignored by the Church. It is, moreover, a question which it seems to me can be easily resolved by a study of the evolution of industrial society. If my opinion is wanted, now that I have raised the question, I can only say, without going into my reasons, that I believe moderate interest is, as a rule, not sinful increase in our days, but that I do think it conduct unbecoming a Christian — to put it very mildly — for a rich man to charge interest on money lent a poor man to relieve him of distress, or to put him on his feet again when he is once down. I do not believe it is right to exact anything more than the return of the principal, nor do I believe that the poor man ought to feel obliged to give more. Rather let him relieve some one else in time of increasing prosperity.

This is, as I take it, the spirit of the old usury laws, for the capitalistic mode of production did not exist when they were promulgated, and loans were made chiefly to relieve personal distress. Now can any one tell why the spirit of the economic and industrial laws of Moses should not be binding on us? Christ said He came to fulfil the law, and those for whom love has abolished the old ceremonial law must feel compelled to do more —

not less — for their fellows, than the old Mosaic legislation required.

Moses founded a commonwealth which, for generations, continued free, happy, prosperous, knowing neither pauperism nor excessive wealth; and Moses, viewed merely as a statesman, probably never stood so high in the estimation of scholars as he does to-day. Yet the Church passes over the Mosaic economic legislation as of no consequence, or as of no binding force. The letter of the law would in this case be death, but I believe the spirit would mean life. There is much in the Mosaic legislation which mere "money-makers," whose Christianity is confined to professions, would not like to hear, but there is reason to think that careful study might have adapted some of its provisions to modern life with benefit to all who wish to live righteously.

There is more or less concern on the part of the clergy with the problems of the day; and as they are so largely ethical, they cannot avoid reference to them in sermons and lectures. Their flocks look to them for leadership, but they too often appear like blind leaders of the blind; for they manifestly have never received instruction in sociology, and there has been universal failure to give it that prolonged, concentrated attention which theology has received for hundreds of years. The blame rests by no means exclusively on the clergy and least of all on the present generation

of clergymen. The mistake is one of historical growth, and we and our fathers, laity as well as clergy, are responsible.

These questions, upon which I barely touch, are difficult, and require profound thought from truly great minds. Is this discouraging? It undoubtedly proves that the course of action for Christians in modern practical life is a difficult one to discern. It undoubtedly proves that it is not easy to follow the command, Love thy neighbor as thyself. I do not suppose that the Almighty intended it should be easy. I do suppose that — to take one example — He intended that the man who carelessly scatters his alms here and there without reflection should be as likely to do harm as good, and that such is the case the history of charities amply demonstrates.

We cannot love our fellows effectively unless we give them our mind. We must devote ourselves long and carefully to the study of the science of human happiness, social science. This second branch of the gospel of Christ, so long neglected, ought to be pursued with equal earnestness, with equal diligence, by Christians, with theology.

Suppose when we went to church we heard Sunday after Sunday nothing about the nature of God, and our relations to Him, save a ceaseless iteration of the first commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with

all thy soul and with all thy mind." That contains all of theology; yet we would regard it as absurd for the minister not to develop the thought of that grand, all-inclusive precept. Equally absurd is it for the Church not to develop in all its ramifications the second commandment.

What is wanted is not dilettanteism with respect to those duties which we owe our fellows, but hard study, pursued with devotion for years. I should say that half of the time of a theological student should be devoted to social science, and theological seminaries should be the chief intellectual centres for sociology.

It is true that we get at the second commandment through the first; and we must first love God, in order to serve as we should our fellow-men.

There seems to be little danger, however, that the theoretical truth respecting our duties to God will be overlooked. The real danger is that we will come to think that we can serve God without devoting our lives to our fellow-men, without becoming in the fullest, completest sense of the word, philanthropists.

Did it ever occur to you that a man who claimed to be a Christian, and was not at the same time a philanthropist, was a hypocrite and a liar? Yet, if Christ speaks true, this is undoubted. Select one of the gospels, and read therein the words of Christ, and you will see how Christ comes back

again and again to our social duties. The Sermon on the Mount illustrates this, as do also the last three verses of the ninth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. Christ was "moved with compassion," and He turned the thoughts of the disciples away from themselves to the plenteous harvest, and bid them pray the Lord of the harvest to "send forth laborers into the harvest." But still more striking are verses fifteen to seventeen, in the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel according to St. John. Christ asks Peter three times if he loves Him. "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" Peter asserts his love each time; and how is he bidden show his love? Is it by fasts? or self-torture for sin? or withdrawal from the world? or prayer and meditation? By no means; but by service to his fellow-creatures. "Feed my lambs" — "feed my lambs" — "feed my sheep." These are the three answers of Jesus.

III.

THE SIMPLE GOSPEL OF CHRIST.

Now what have been the results of this neglect by the Church of the nature of our duties to our fellow-men? They have been of the most far-reaching character, and explain the fact that, in eighteen hundred years, the Church has not made greater progress.

The cause of this neglect is sin. Largely, if not chiefly, the sin of concession to the powers of this world, so that they might hear nothing to terrify or alarm them, or even to make them uncomfortable; and the result has been sin, sin, sin, until in the markets of the world you cannot distinguish a Christian from one who professes to live for this world only. Howells says — and I believe truly — that it is a sorrowful comment upon our Christianity that Tolstoï's frank acceptance of the message of Christ should make him seem to the world as eccentric or mad. What are you going to do about it?

I notice that, according to Mr. Howells, a radical clergyman replies: Yes, those are doubtless the teachings of Christ; but the political economy of Christ was ignorant and mistaken. He says that

Christ was a good soul, but an inferior intellect. You see we have here the old question, What will you do with Christ? One answer is given, and it reduces Him to the rank of idle dreamers of impossible Utopias; a good man, but one of weak mental capacities. Whether or not Mr. Howells has correctly interpreted this clergyman, it is, at any rate, but an exact description of a common form of unbelief, though it rarely finds so frank and outspoken an expression. A clergyman of another denomination recently used these words in a published article: "If the Bible entirely sustains 'Progress and Poverty,' then with Mr. Henry George the Bible must stand or fall. For my own part, if I could be convinced that the Bible did somewhere or other really affirm the peculiar doctrines of that very popular agitator, that part of the Bible I should most unhesitatingly reject." And in the same article, after stating that his first great master in political economy was John Stuart Mill, for whom he has never lost his reverence, he proceeds to state that Mill seems to him "to be superseded neither by Moses nor by Karl Marx." I do not quote this because I believe that Henry George is indorsed by the Bible, any more than I believe that Tolstoï is free from grave defects, but to show the position into which a considerable portion of the Church has drifted.

Let us look at this matter from a somewhat different standpoint. The prayer for us all is:

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth." Yet the Church has so failed to instruct us in regard to the will of God in earthly matters, that professed Christians seem at times to lose all distinction between right and wrong in affairs of this life, and occasionally one hears it said that Christian ethics have nothing to do with practical business. Let us take this matter of gambling in stocks or provisions. I mean merely speculative dealings — not *bona fide* purchases. Can a Christian do such a thing? If social science had been studied by Christian ministers with as much diligence as the one theological doctrine of baptism, there could be no doubt — it would be needless to ask the question.

What is the essence of theft? I mean from a moral, not a legal, point of view. Is it not trying to get something for nothing? Is it not trying to get hold of your neighbor's property by some kind of hocus-pocus, without making him a fair return? Most assuredly; and that is precisely what those do who buy stocks on margin, deal in futures, and the like. I was glad to see, in a village paper published in New York State, so clear a moral perception of the nature of the transactions of a misguided and fallen young man who lost money in wheat speculations, stole money from the bank of which he was president, and fled to Canada. Suppose his wheat speculations had been successful, would that have altered his moral character?

Most certainly not. He was all the time engaged in attempts to get hold of the property of others without a return. There is only this difference. In the one case he would have been, morally speaking, a thief; now he is, legally speaking, a thief. This paper to which I have referred then very properly says: "We may look for the cause of this fall to the unholy greed for money, the reckless spirit of gambling and speculation, so common in these last years."

I was also glad to see — and it is a cheerful sign of the times — a powerful article on this very topic in a Presbyterian paper, published in Omaha, I believe, but the name of the journal escapes me.

I do not mean to condemn unreservedly the stock exchange. A considerable part of its business is perfectly legitimate. Nevertheless, it is a great gain when the speculative element in its transactions can be dismissed. Professor Adolf Wagner, of Berlin, counts it as one of the good features which have resulted from the purchase of Prussian private railways, by the state, that their stocks can no longer be used as formerly, *merely* for speculative, that is, gambling purposes. I regard this as a strong argument for the nationalization of railways. The idea of the stock exchange is sound, but it is inevitably so fruitful of mischief and all manner of iniquity that we can regard it only as a necessary evil and must rejoice when the field of its operations is curtailed.

Yes, yes; strange conceptions have people of the gospel of Christ! and a phrase has been invented, "the simple gospel of Christ," which means an emasculated gospel of Christ, a gospel of Christ with one-half omitted, a gospel which, while teaching us to pray Thy will be done on earth, yet would keep Christians from concerning themselves with things of this world, so that the will of God may be done — things like temperance, righteous dealing, fair elections, the uprooting of crime and poverty, the elevation of the masses.

Two years ago last winter, in Baltimore, the street-car employés were working over seventeen hours a day, and rebelled against this monstrous cruelty. A mass meeting was called to favor the passage of a bill for a twelve-hour day — a bill finally passed — and several clergymen attended the meeting and spoke in favor of the measure. One clergyman, Mr. S., took the ground that it was a question of the preservation of that Christian institution, the family; for what kind of a family life can you have where the father is away seventeen hours a day, seven days in the week, and scarcely knows his children by sight? Well, shortly after the event, a Presbyterian minister, Mr. G., was accosted by one of his parishioners with the remark, "I wish your friend, Mr. S., would confine himself to preaching the simple gospel of Christ." "The simple gospel of Christ,"

replied Mr. G., "the simple gospel of Christ! What is this I hear, my friend? So you own some street-railway stock, do you?" The parishioner looked very uncomfortable, and finally confessed that, though he didn't, his wife did.

Two years ago the present autumn we heard of a somewhat similar instance, in what is called Mr. Moody's church in Chicago. Rev. Mr. Goss preached a sermon on the trials and temptations of working-girls, and remedies for them, to which some members of his flock objected — not because they took exception to any specific utterance, but because they wanted simple gospel sermons. Simple gospel sermons, indeed! More likely, if we may judge from other instances, because they wanted to serve Mammon six days a week, and to atone for it by formal lip service rendered to God on the seventh! If the preacher had hammered away at the sins of the ancient Egyptians, four thousand years ago, or the immoralities of Paris, four thousand miles away, we would hardly have heard objections because the sermon was not a simple gospel sermon.

Once more: some earnest men have formed the American Economic Association, to investigate problems of social science, in order thereby to contribute to human progress. Its aim is to advocate no opinions, but simply to strive to find out the underlying principles of industrial society, and to diffuse information among the working

classes and all classes. Briefly stated, its purpose is to study seriously the second of the two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets, in all its ramifications, and thus to bring science to the aid of Christianity.

Now you would imagine this something to appeal to every Christian, would you not? Yet it does not. As secretary, it has been my duty to solicit members, and raise the few hundred dollars needed every year for printing its publications and other purposes, and I can assure the reader it seems impossible to induce one in ten Christians, among those who can well afford it, to contribute three dollars a year or twenty-five dollars for a life membership.

It is difficult for them to grasp the idea that this society is a real legitimate Christian institution. Prizes encourage research. The experience of our best universities with fellowships, shows the advantages of prizes, suitable in amount and awarded under satisfactory conditions. Yet any one who will try — as several have done — to raise a few hundred dollars for prizes for the best monographs on subjects like Child Labor, Women Wage-Earners, The Housing of the Poor in Cities, Taxation in American Cities, will be surprised at the general apathy and indifference of people asked to contribute, and to find how few they are, comparatively, who seem to care to do anything more for their suffering fellow-creatures than to administer some kind of soothing-syrup.

Now it must not be supposed that I am pessimistic. Far from it. I see many evidences of better things. To begin with this very association of which I have spoken: we do get sufficient support to live, and no professional class is so largely represented in our membership as clergymen.

The American Economic Association is mentioned, not because it is more important than other societies, but because its history has shown me the feeling of too many Christians with respect to simple philanthropy, unconnected with any sectarian glory, and because it serves as illustration. Illustrations abound on every street-corner in every city. As I was waiting one Sunday in a hotel parlor in Toronto, Canada, I heard two ladies discussing the fact that street cars in that city did not run on Sunday. The decision finally reached was that the only good feature about the arrangement was that it gave the horses a chance to rest! And are not societies for prevention of cruelty to animals stronger than those for prevention of cruelty to children?

Most remarkable is the illustration given of the shortcoming of the Church by the hymns of the Church. It is said you may know a nation by its songs. We may know the life of the Church by its hymns. If the Church in her history has been full of love for man, it must be seen in her hymns. Hearts welling up, filled to overflowing with love

to our fellows, must seek expression in song. Let the reader take any hymn-book he pleases and read hymn after hymn, and seek for the hymns expressive of burning, all-consuming altruism. He will not find them, though he will find any number which turn the heart in on itself and tend to nourish a selfish, individualistic piety. I and me — I and me — these are the frequently recurring pronouns.

Theological seminaries — would that they might be called gospel seminaries — are beginning to turn at least some serious attention to social science, which, if it be little, is nevertheless a beginning. The Andover, Yale, and Hartford seminaries have courses of lectures on social science, and I see that Bishop Potter of the Episcopal Church includes provision for instruction in social science in his plan for a great cathedral in New York.

I would gladly dwell on some conclusions which flow naturally from what has been said, but the shortness of space forbids it, and I can only call attention to a few things which Christianity requires.

First, let us look at the internal arrangements of the Church. It goes without saying that these should be thoroughly Christian; but what does that mean? To begin with, certainly an absence of all that fosters the caste spirit — for that separates man from his brother; and a presence of everything which tends to draw man to man, and

thus to promote a realizing sense of the brotherhood of man.

We are taught that the strong should bear the burdens of the weak, from which we may conclude that the Church should be tender and considerate in all her dealings with the unfortunate, with all those that labor and are heavily laden. Apply this to dress. The attire of Christians should be plain and simple, such as will not divert attention from the Word of God.

An entire absence of everything in dress which cultivates worldliness and awakens a desire for perishable riches must be enjoined. Absence of such dress as will awaken envious desires in weak natures is equally a matter of course. And this means not merely plain dressing; for the simple dressing so often admired in fashionable churches is frequently more expensive, far more expensive, than the gaudiest dress in poorer churches. Plain and inexpensive dress is what is required. Rich Christians are especially called upon to take the lead in all this. Let the strong bear the burdens of the weak.

Apply Christian principles to the matter of pews. We all know what James says about those who give the back seats to the poor, and the choice seats to those of goodly apparel and gold rings. Yet by our system of rented pews — for we have gone so far as to introduce notions of private property in the house of God — we do not simply

occasionally violate the command given by James, but we bring it about that the rich habitually have the best seats.

Now, as I take it, the Christian principle is this: Seat first the guests of the church. The Christian duty of hospitality enjoins upon us to reserve the best for the stranger. Then the poorer people should follow, and the rich and powerful, the strong, should take what is left.

The ordinary arguments in opposition to free churches are "of the earth, earthy." They are said not to be "practical." "It won't work," we are told. What has a Christian to do except to believe that the right is practical, and the only practical thing in the universe? Christ's life itself was not, as the world goes, very practical. One might have told Him, "This will not work. You are not practical." And indeed He was rejected and put to death, and His life *appeared* to be a worse failure than a church sold at public auction by the sheriff.

Friendly intercourse between church members is likewise an obvious duty; but I have never yet heard any attendant on a fashionable church exclaim, "How these Christians love one another!"

The injunction of Christ in regard to feasts, I think, ought to be taken literally. A Christian will seek out the neglected, the lonesome, the needy brothers and sisters, and invite those who can never reciprocate with like social courtesies.

IV.

THE CHRISTIAN IN THE WORLD, BUT NOT OF THE WORLD.

Besides the exhibition within the Church of the spirit of Christian brotherhood, the life of Christians outside of the Church, in their dealings with the world, must also conform to Christian principles. Christ calls upon us to choose between Him and the world, and He wants no half-hearted followers. Remember the message unto the Laodiceans: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."

Every opportunity to bring to pass righteousness in this world is one that a Christian cannot neglect. There are the working classes needing intellectual and moral enlightenment — and rich people, too, equally needing enlightenment — there are children, little children in factories, ruining body, mind and soul by excessive toil and danger-

ous companionship at a tender age, who ought to be rescued; there are women engaged in improper toil away from home; there is intemperance, the curse of liquor, to be fought; there are tenement-house districts to be redeemed — work, work on every hand for Christian men and women, but where are the workers?

Some say we cannot maintain ourselves in the business world if we attempt to carry into our business Christian principles. Very well, then, change the world until Christians can live in it; and in the meanwhile let me remind the reader, with Rev. Mark Guy Pearse, that there was a time when men and women could not be Christians and keep their heads on their shoulders, and that then they died cheerfully as Christians.

It is one of the fundamental principles of Christianity that temporal goods are committed to us in trust, and that we shall be held accountable for our trusteeship. But temporal goods mean more than money. They include time and opportunities, and the idle man is truly a robber — a robber of God's bounty. If we deliberately and persistently fail even to try honestly to administer our property, — be it much or little, — also our time, talents and opportunities, according to the principles of altruism — by which I mean simply all-embracing Christian love — we cannot fairly claim to be Christians, and, if the Bible speaks true, pains await us for our disobedience. It is idle to

talk about a belief which does not manifest itself in works. A good tree must bring forth good fruit. It is the law of nature. So when a heart is welling over with love to all of God's children, loving action is bound to follow. It comes of itself, just as the trees put forth their leaves in spring-time.

How, then, do professing Christians employ their substance? When one visits the leading churches of New York and Boston, when one forms acquaintanceship with their members, with the very best will, it is simply impossible to believe that they are even trying to place the needs of others on a par with their own needs. Self comes first, and there is little apparent effort to obey, in their expenditures of money, the precept that love for others should hold equal place with love for self. The more seriously one reflects upon this, the longer one turns it over in one's mind, the more shocking appears the divergence between profession and practice. The average Christian is "of the world," and is governed by its motives in his expenditures. To get on in life, to enjoy the pleasures of wealth, to be spoken well of by those high in the ranks of fashion — all this is the dominating motive. Consider a case like this: a man spends $1500 on an evening's entertainment to gratify vanity. What could have been done with $1500? Here is one thing: it could have been used to endow a permanent scholarship in

the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia. Let the reader reflect upon that. It means that for all time our colored pupil shall receive education at this most excellent school where with the training of the head goes the training of the hand — one of the most essential things in the development of the colored race. These Hampton pupils go forth to serve as teachers and preachers, and form the best leaders of their people. The colored youth educated are benefited, and those whom they influence are benefited. This is not only Christian, it is patriotic, for our American institutions depend upon the elevation of the ignorant masses, and how urgent are the appeals for means with which to extend this work! Read these words from the circular of that admirable man, Gen. S. C. Armstrong: —

"In the country districts, which contain the majority and the best material of the colored population, the teacher is usually the only fit and available leader. He, and he only, can start Sunday-schools and temperance societies, can initiate sound Christian work, and overcome the hostile influence of the 'old-time religion' and its votaries. In the earlier stages of a people's progress, the teacher's sphere is in the field, shop, church, and home, as much as in the schoolhouse. In the past eighteen years our army of graduates has done this many-sided work among a benighted people thirsting for knowledge. They have secured

the good-will of all true men, and peace and progress have followed them.

"Is there any sounder policy, any more comprehensive philanthropy, than that which shall firmly establish such schools as Hampton, and enable them to pour into this mass of ignorance an annual stream of self-reliant young men and women whose training has included the whole range of practical living? The South calls for over twice as many teachers as can be supplied for its 15,000 negro schools."

It is within bounds to say that within a comparatively near future 1000 people will be rendered happier and better by a gift of $1500 to the Hampton Institute. Now will a man who spends $1500 for an evening's pleasure, or for any luxury whatsoever — even should the enjoyment of it extend through years — tell me that he is sincerely endeavoring to act with respect to these poor colored people, in accordance with God's command that he should love his neighbor as himself?

It is not my purpose to make a plea for Hampton. This is merely an illustration. I have known $1500 to send 100 boys from the slums of New York to homes in the West, where the majority — not all, but a large majority — will become honest, industrious, and useful citizens. Reflect on the incalculable amount of good that such an expenditure produces. Yet a professedly Christian woman will sometimes spend $1500 on dress in a year!

There is a plea for extravagance with which it is hard to have patience, so obviously is it contradicted by the application of a little common sense. It is said it gives employment to labor — as if every expenditure of money did not do that! It would be hard to name an expenditure of $1500, which would give such a vast amount of employment to labor as the endowment of a Hampton scholarship, or the removal of 100 boys from the slums of New York. The employment which a feast or a few fashionable dresses give is not to be mentioned in comparison. You, my reader, are bound to employ labor when you spend money, but God gives you a choice. You may employ the labor to work for yourself, or you may give labor such a direction that others will receive benefit therefrom, and you are answerable for that choice. If you spend $200 on a dress, you do it because you prefer your happiness to others. That same money spent for cheaper dresses for old ladies in a home would give quite as much employment.[1]

Now the number of ways in which money can be so spent as to benefit others, not to pauperize others like alms-giving, but to lift up men and women into a higher life, is simply infinite. If one has the wealth of Crœsus, every cent of it can be spent advantageously for the good of men. Tenement house reform in the single city of New

[1] This thought is more amply developed in my Political Economy, Chautauqua Press, 1889.

York could well consume eighteen millions of dollars. Take the grand work going forward at Chautauqua, which only needs comparatively little money to place it upon a firm foundation, but which could use profitably millions. The Chautauqua work in its various ramifications reaches three or four hundred thousand people a year, and all over the length and breadth of the land are scattered isolated households, hamlets, villages, even cities, whose life is richer and fuller by reason of Chautauqua. Baltimore is to-day a happier and better city because Mr. Enoch Pratt gave over a million dollars to found a magnificent free library with branches all over the city. But in every State there are villages and even large cities without suitable libraries. Playgrounds for children are a need in every city. The love of the beautiful ought to be cultivated by better public art galleries than exist in this country, and by more of them. The money which can be spent in improving elementary instruction, by adding to it physical culture, sewing, cooking, and manual training, is simply unlimited, while even a little can do much for one primary school. Limits of space forbid any extended mention of mission work at home and abroad; but it is safe to say that if Christians were consistent in their use of wealth, the revenues of home and foreign missionary societies would be quadrupled immediately.

A Christian may say, if I love my neighbor as

myself, my necessities are as important as his. True, but my comforts are not as important as his necessities, nor are my luxuries and superfluities as important as my neighbor's comforts. Luxury can never be indulged in by a Christian so long as he can minister to the real well-being of others, and supply them with material goods helpful for their development; and this forever renders luxury an impossibility for a Christian.

Luxury is materialistic and selfish; it retards the mental and spiritual development of a people, and tends to impoverish a nation. Luxury breeds luxury, as sin begets sin. One tries to outvie another. Men spend more than they can afford. Speculation is fostered as a means of money-getting, and fraud and embezzlement are the legitimate outcome. Wasted fortunes, blighted careers, broken hearts, boundless opportunities forever lost, — these are the end of which the beginning is self-indulgence.

It is impossible for a Christian carefully to examine the nature of industrial society, or even to look a very little way into social science, without drawing a very close line around personal expenditures which are not sinful. This looks very much like cross-bearing, and it seems to me that we modern Christians have well-nigh forgotten the existence of a cross. Christ meant that we should lead a life of renunciation. He said we must take up our cross. What He did say was this: "My

yoke is easy, and My burden is light." Why? Because love renders sacrifice easy; and if we love our neighbor as Christ loved us, we will rejoice that it is permitted us to give our goods, our lives, and all that we have, for others, and we will account the renunciation of pleasures in which this world delights as but an easy yoke and a light burden.

V.

THE ALIENATION OF WAGE-WORKERS FROM THE CHURCH.

THERE are those who deny that wage-workers are alienated from the Church, and I have carefully considered their arguments; but after years of observation and reflection I have been forced to the conclusion that there is a clear alienation of thinking wage-workers from the Church which, on the whole, is growing. I do not say this with any other feeling than one of profound regret; but as it appears to me a fact which can be denied only by those who are ignorant of the actual situation, I hold it to be well that it should be known.

I could give evidence which would fill pages of this book; but as there are other things to be said, I can only leave my readers to look carefully into the matter, and by a perusal of the labor press, and by conversation with representative wage-earners, to form an opinion for themselves. I think, however, I can safely say that I have had unusually favorable opportunities for getting at the facts, as I have followed the labor movement with interest, and have enjoyed the confidence of representative workingmen to a great extent.

This alienation sometimes amounts to positive hostility, as I think is quite generally the case in New York and Chicago. In other places, as in Baltimore, there is little aggressive opposition, but simply widespread indifference. I will quote a few sentences from a labor paper, published in Chicago, by men who are inclined to be comparatively conservative, and who resist all proposals of violence and anarchy as stoutly as any so-called "capitalistic" newspaper. These words, I think, represent fairly the honest opinion of a large class of our best wage-workers: —

> On Thursday evening the Rev. C. F. Goss addressed a meeting called under the auspices of the Brotherhood of Carpenters. . . . In order to get an expression of opinion from his audience, he asked those who had ceased to sympathize with the churches to hold up their hand. It is needless to say the number of hands that were uplifted caused a pang of regret to the speaker.
>
> A question that we would like to propound to the ministers of Chicago is: Have the working classes fallen away from the churches, or have the churches fallen away from the working classes? We know hundreds and thousands of workingmen who have the utmost respect, admiration, and even love for the pure and simple teachings of the gospel, and the beneficent and exalted character of Jesus Christ, and yet they scarcely ever put their feet inside the Church that "is called" His. Not because they love the Church less, but because they love their self-respect more. They realize that there is no place in the average Chicago church for the poor man unless it is in the position of janitor, certainly not in the cushioned pews surrounded by individuals who not only regard poverty as a disgrace, but by their

vulgar display endeavor to perpetually remind the poor man of his poverty. . . . While there are noble and notable exceptions, it must be confessed that but few of the average Chicago preachers go out of their way to "preach the gospel to the poor"—of course "good" people who are "rich" establish mission schools for "bad" people who are "poor," and they occasionally succeed in bringing within the fold a few women and children who are not sufficiently intelligent to realize that a mission school is a sort of a religious soup-house, where the gospel is distributed as charity.

One reason why wage-workers do not love the Church is not peculiar. The wickedness of men's hearts leads them to resist the gospel. Workingmen are like others in this respect, although certain temptations, as pride, and arrogance, and absorption by concerns of this world, are not so powerful in their case. We must remember that Christ said it was hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, and never alluded to any special difficulties in the way of the poor as a class. We are also told that time was when the common people heard Christ gladly. These, however, are general considerations. What is now desired is to know the peculiar cause which alienates wage-workers as a class of industrial society from the Church, and this may be stated in a single sentence.

The leaders of the Church, the representative men and women in the Church, profess to love the working classes, but as a matter of fact, they do not love them, and this wide divergence be-

tween profession and practice is keenly felt. I here state a grave charge, but who among my readers will deny it? Before any one does, let him examine his own conscience.

How do I know that church-goers do not love the day laborer? How do I know that my wife loves me? There is a conduct suitable to love; a conduct not prescribed by law, but which is the natural, spontaneous outcome of love. Now the consequences which would inevitably follow did the representative men and women of the Church love the bread-winners of the United States are sadly missing. I will give a few specifications.

First, these church leaders are so far away from the toiling masses that they fail to understand their desires, and the motives of their action. I meet few clergymen who, even when they want to be friendly, can give an intelligent statement of the side of labor in any of its many controversies with capital. They rarely converse with leaders of the workingmen, and perhaps more rarely read any labor paper. If they loved the masses, they would instinctively draw near enough to know their aims and motives. Christ moved among the masses and understood them, and to-day the poorest laborer and the most obstinate trades unionists, yes, even the despised walking delegate, will feel a strange attraction for that wonderful Being who spoke words which go straight to the heart. Did not an assembly of

workingmen in these United States not long ago greet the name of Christ with applause, and the mention of the Church with hisses?

Second, the failure to rebuke wickedness in high places is noticed. When you go into a church on Fifth Avenue in New York, rarely, if ever, do you hear the corrupt methods by which the masses have been robbed, and prominent people made millionnaires, described and denounced with righteous indignation. When not a workingman is present, the wicked labor agitators are lashed with fury. Why this? Is there any danger that a wealthy congregation in one of our cities will be carried away by the pleadings of the agitator? None at all. Those who sit in the pews have a sufficient appreciation of the wickedness of Knights of Labor and socialists. If the aim were to draw men together, those who minister to congregations made up of employers would so put the case of their employés that it could be understood, and would say everything favorable which could be said in their behalf.[1]

More ought to be said about the duties of property, for we Americans have a sufficiently keen appreciation of the rights of property. Could the

[1] I readily admit that the clergy are better than the laity, take them as a whole. The minister of a fashionable church who tries to do his duty has indeed a hard time, and recent experiences of conscientious and fearless ministers are truly pathetic.

idea be conveyed to the supporters of our churches that property exists for the sake of man, and not man for the sake of property, incalculable good would follow.

Third, the negative attitude of the Church with respect to every proposed reform discourages, disgusts, and even angers, workingmen. The religious press is concerned with the "errors of socialism," "the errors of Henry George," and, in short, the errors of any one who proposes anything positive. "The errors of socialism!" Why talk about them? Are they a living issue? Is there the slightest danger that they will not be sufficiently discussed? There is about as much prospect of a realization of the socialist's dream, in our day, as there is that New Hampshire farmers will harvest their grain in January. If we could hear something about the "truths of socialism" and "the truths of Henry George," it would be far more to the point.

Workingmen — I am talking all the time about the thinking workingmen — instinctively feel that if the Church were animated by love, she would be more anxious to discover truths than errors in the plans of those who are working for the elevation of the masses.

Nothing so disheartens one as the failure of Christians to engage in positive work for the masses. One would at least suppose that such a question as freedom from toil on Sunday would

concern the clergy. Yet it does not seem to. Scarcely a question is more alive to-day among all labor organizations than compulsory Sunday work. All over the country, when laboring men meet, they pass resolutions on this subject, and appeal to the public to help them to secure one day in seven for rest. Yet the pulpit is silent. The bakers in New York recently sent petitions to the clergymen of New York and Brooklyn to preach on the subject, and to help them to abolish Sunday work. What came of it? I wrote to the secretary of their national organization to tell me, and here are extracts from his letter: "The Sunday law was not even presented to that Legislature. . . . Relying on what the clergy will ever do to assist in enforcing Sabbath laws is equal to relying on a rain of manna that may make labor superfluous. . . . These gentlemen are more interested in the movement of boodle than in the movement of labor. . . . I consented to convince our men that I was right. They are convinced to-day. Out of 500 circulars sent to the clergy of New York and Brooklyn, half a dozen answered. You will have a hard time, Professor, to convince the toilers of this country that the clergy will ever do anything for them. There is no money in it, you know."

When the clergy of one denomination in Pittsburg, Pa., learned that a gentleman had given money for public conservatories, on condition that

they should be kept open on Sunday, they denounced the man, and passed formal resolutions against the acceptance of the gift. What kind of effect must that produce on the workingmen of Pittsburg, who never received aid from these clergymen in attempts to abolish Sunday work? A prominent Presbyterian clergyman of Baltimore called on me recently, and wanted to know why the Church failed to get a hold on the workingmen of our city. Had he gone with me to listen to one of his eloquent friends the following Sunday, he would have heard some sound doctrine on Sabbath-keeping, and some courageous utterances on the subject of Sunday festivities in homes of the wealthy in Baltimore. A workingman would have reflected that not a word was said about those who must toil seven days a week. The bakers in Baltimore might have been favorably impressed by something on that topic. And a word to stockholders in street railways would not have been out of place, for shortly after the sermon one of the conductors remarked to me, incidentally, that he had had only one Sunday "off" in twenty-two months.

Anarchistic workingmen contribute, from their scanty earnings, money to disseminate their pernicious doctrines, and wage-workers can at least ask the question, Why do not Christians who profess to love us manifest the same zeal for the dissemination of true doctrines on social and eco-

nomic topics, if these things which we hear are so bad? The Economic Association published a monograph, by Dr. Albert Shaw of the Minneapolis *Tribune*, on Co-operation, which was most instructive and wholesome in tone. It did not advocate any rash measures, but told the story of some successful enterprises in Minneapolis. Many workingmen are engaged in like enterprises, and it is safe to say so practical a treatise would save them $100,000 a year. Five hundred dollars would be ample to print 10,000 copies to advertise them, and to sell them for a small sum, say ten cents, whereas the monograph in its original form cost seventy-five cents. The New York *Tribune* reviewed it favorably, and expressed the hope that a cheap reprint might appear for wide circulation. Hon. Andrew D. White wrote to me, and urged that it be reprinted for workingmen. Rev. Dr. Thwing of Minneapolis wrote a similar letter. I tried to raise the money, but my appeals to Christians of means were of no avail. I might as well have addressed the ocean. How can men full of love be so careless and indifferent?

Then there is the question of the rights of the masses. What safety is there for the property of the masses, for public property, in the fact that our cities are full of churches? I visited Montreal last summer, and when I saw the many churches I asked myself this question: Are the rights of the people better protected here than

elsewhere? Afterwards I learned that the franchise for street railways had been extended for twenty-one years without any compensation to the public. This was public robbery; for had the franchise been put up at auction, it would have brought a large sum to the relief of the taxpayers; or lower fares might have been established, a blessing to workingmen and workingwomen. In Baltimore I fear public property is about to be sacrificed similarly. Many churches exist, but the forgotten millions are still the forgotten, plundered millions.

This is not exhaustive, but my essay is too long. I trust that it may start useful trains of thought in my readers, and arouse more than one conscience to a keener sense of duty. It is not pleasant to write a paper like this, but I believe it is time some one should speak plainly. Some say the condition of the Church is hopeless. This I do not believe.

There is in the Church a conscience which can be pricked, and it is probably as sensitive to-day as it has been in centuries gone by. There is a power back of the Church, in her divine Master, which makes for righteousness, and which urges her on to a higher life. What is needed is to go back to Christ and learn of Him.

II.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

Dr. Thomas Arnold of Rugby spoke of the pretended conversion of the kingdoms of the world to the kingdom of Christ in the fourth and fifth centuries, as one of the greatest tricks that Satan, that arch-juggler, ever played, and then he adds: "I mean that by inducing kings and nations to conform nominally to Christianity, and thus to get into their hands the direction of Christian society, he has in a great measure succeeded in keeping out the peculiar principles of that society from any extended sphere of operations, and in insuring the ascendency of his own." Canon Fremantle, in his wonderful book "The World as the Subject of Redemption," — as suggestive a work as I ever read, — speaks more cautiously, it is true, of the nominal conversion of Heathendom under Constantine, but nevertheless he holds that the outcome of the reconciliation between the leaders of Christianity and the rulers of this world was unfortunate in many respects. These are his words: "In the case before us, that of the relation of the first Christian emperor to the Church, we cannot but believe that, had his imperial

duties been recognized more fully as a church function, many mistakes and conflicts would have been avoided, and the effect of Christianity upon the Empire would have been both sounder and more extensive. Had it been acknowledged that human justice in its highest and Christian sense is the thing chiefly aimed at by the Church, the effect would have been to sanctify the government of the Empire. . . . When the moment came at which the Church leaders might have advanced to claim the general life of mankind for Christ, they shrank back. Like the Jews of the first century, they knew not their day of visitation. They cared for the formal guarantees of Christianity, for its correct statement, for the provision made for its worship, above all, for their own order; they willingly used the imperial power for these purposes, and it was for these that it was least fitted."[1] Taking these extracts from these two eminent men as my text, I wish to say a word to you about the relation of Christianity to this world in which we live.

[1] The almanac for 1889, issued by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, contains an interesting confirmation of this view. Tiridates, an Armenian king, adopted Christianity as the State religion about 300 A.D., and a little later Constantine made it the religion of the Roman Empire. Nominal Christianity has continued to exist to this day in Asia Minor, but the writer in this almanac says of the nominal Christianity of these sovereigns, and of the conversion of their subjects, that the event "was a severer blow to Christianity than persecution had been, for it brought into it worldliness, formalism, and even something of heathenism."

I take this as my thesis: Christianity is primarily concerned with this world, and it is the mission of Christianity to bring to pass here a kingdom of righteousness and to rescue from the evil one and redeem all our social relations.

I believe it a common impression that Christianity is concerned primarily with a future state of existence, and to this unfortunate error I trace an alliance between the Church and the powers of this world which found its exemplification in the alleged conversion of Constantine the Great. The mission of the Church is to redeem the world, and to make peace with it only on its unconditional surrender to Christ. Now, a surrender is one thing, an alliance is another. If peace and harmony prevailed between the powers of the world and the Church because the world had become thoroughly Christian, we would have reason for joy, and joy only. Men, angels, and archangels would then lift up their voices in songs of triumph, and the morning stars would join them all in a glorious chorus.

Unhappily, peace has never been made after this fashion. Whenever an agreement has been reached between the Church and the world, the terms have been a division of territory, as it were, and that on this wise: The world has transferred the domain of dogma and the future life to the Church, but has kept for itself the present life. I believe with Arnold, that Satan has in such an

arrangement displayed his cunning in a rare degree.

We are placed here in this world to do here the work which offers itself to us as Christian men and women. The next world may have its work, but when we get to heaven it will be time enough for us to concern ourselves with that. Undoubtedly this world is but a training school, but what kind of work will a boy do in college who busies himself unduly with speculations about the future life for which he is preparing himself? We teachers know very well. We say to such a lad, "This will not do. You are wasting your time and dissipating your energies. Keep your mind on your present tasks, and by excellence in performing them you will be best prepared for your subsequent career."

Divines have doubted whether any clear intimation of a future life is given in the writings of Moses, although there is every reason to suppose that he was familiar with the doctrine of immortality which was taught in Egypt. It has, however, been held that he purposely refrained from the expression of any views on the immortality of the soul, because he had seen the abuses and superstitions which inevitably clustered about it, and the hold it gave a cruel and corrupt priestcraft on the masses. It was, it is thought, in a way, a dangerous doctrine, and God waited for a more favorable time to give us a clear revelation about

immortality. Jesus Christ brought to the light and for Christians proved the doctrine of the immortality of man. Yet read all that He says. Take your New Testament and read one after another His words, without the assistance of any commentary, and see how little He says about a future life. Nearly everything in the words of Christ applies to the present life. Take His longest discourse as recorded in the gospel according to St. Matthew in chapters V., VI., VII., and it hardly mentions the subject of a future life, barely alluding to it once or twice. Take the Lord's Prayer contained in this sermon, and it may be argued that it does not at all teach the immortality of the soul. Notice also how quickly Christ turns His disciples away from speculations about the future to present duties, when they approach Him with inquiries about the hereafter. And the rich young man seeking salvation is not taught to believe in a set of metaphysical propositions in regard to the hereafter, but is told first of all to sell his property and give it to the poor, then to follow Jesus and be ready for immediate service in the kingdom of Christ here on earth.

The disciples want to know who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven, and He sets a child in the midst of them, teaches them the duty of humility, and declares to them that, whosoever "shall receive one such little one in my name receiveth me." The mother of Zebedee's children wants high

rank for them in the kingdom of Christ, and rebuking her, He hastens to improve the opportunity by pointing out service to one's fellows as the main thing about which they should concern themselves. "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant."[1]

Let no one misunderstand me. I do not undervalue the glorious revelation of eternal life which Christ brought us. That is our hope, our inspiration, our consolation, and our warning. Very precious to the Christian is the resurrection of Christ. We are permitted to look forward to a future to complete what is begun here. Yet when we have that we have all, or nearly all, that Christ thought fit to tell us of heaven.

We go to the Bible with the notion that we are to learn about heaven rather than about earth, and so we make things apply to a future existence which were intended for this world. Even the translators of the Bible appear to have been led away from sound learning by the popular notion. In one place the Old Version reads, "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved," but the New Version gives us the correct translation, which is, "and the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved"[2] — were being saved then and there. "He that believeth

[1] Matt. xx., vv. 20–28; cf. "the chapter of woes," Matt. xxiii.

[2] Acts ii. 47.

on me hath everlasting life."[1] — Why, he who makes a profession of Christianity with the hope of escaping some dire calamity hereafter, and only for that hope, has not taken the first step in the Christian life. — "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins."[2] He that is not striving to depart from sin has not begun the Christian life.

The results of the alliance of which I have spoken are the most disastrous, and we see them all about us. Things are divided into things sacred and things secular, but to a Christian all things must be sacred — his business as well as his church, for is he not to use his business as an instrument for bringing righteousness to pass in this world — to bring to an end the present evil age which Christ condemned? For not the world but this evil age, the evil in the world, was anathematized. "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth" — we pray ever for the salvation of the world, the kosmos.

Then we have a division of days — one sacred, the others secular. St. Paul, it seems to me, taught that every day was holy. I do not mean that I would have less said about the observance of Sunday, but more about God's service on the other six days of the week. Because we have concerned ourselves too much with the hereafter, we have neglected an examination of present duties.

[1] John vi. 47. [2] Matt. i. 21.

The current ideas of right and wrong must fill one with sadness and dismay. Many a Christian cannot grasp the sinfulness of lotteries, does not perceive that it is trying to get something for nothing — the essence of theft. So some cannot perceive the iniquity of a man who builds houses on land which he knows the state, nation, or city will want — builds them, I mean, purposely to be sold at a profit and then torn down. Some cannot perceive that it is a sin to work a man sixteen hours a day if his necessities compel him to agree to such an arrangement.

We may find help if we look at this matter from a somewhat different standpoint. Human duties are duties for this world. Now if we find that Christ chiefly emphasizes our obligations to men living on earth, it follows naturally that the Church is concerned with this world rather than the next.

The love of the apostles for their fellow-men is marvellous, breaking down prejudices of creed and race — prejudices stronger than we can well understand at this day. The nearest analogy is furnished by the colored race. We know what hostility would be aroused in our South should prominent church leaders eat at the table with negroes and otherwise associate with them on terms of social equality. Yet the prejudice against Gentiles, against sinners and outcasts, in the time of Christ must have been stronger still, and their

prejudices were supported by religious conviction and philosophical thought. Nevertheless, love carried Peter and Paul and other primitive Christians over these barriers, although the victory cost many a struggle.

Love is the wonderful word of the New Testament. We must even love those that malign us. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Here is your test again. Otherwise ye cannot be the children of your Father. Otherwise ye cannot be followers of Christ.

"For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye?" If you love them only, then you are not saved, then you cannot be saved without a regeneration.

You come upon this wonderful, this marvellous love for man which Christ taught all through the gospel. It is not merely taught by Christ, but it is illustrated by Christ in His life until we come to that scene on the cross when He prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

It is in this duty to love and serve our fellows that I find the most convincing proof of the divinity of Christ. I think it is this which reassures me amid the doubts of our time: I have no evidence in history to convince me that a mere man would have exalted man as Christ did. Let

us see your love for God in your manifest love for man. This is the message of Christ. This I regard as the grand distinctive feature of Christianity, the exaltation of humanity. I will not say the worship of humanity, but surely it is safe to say all but the worship of humanity. We find philosophers of the grandest type despising humanity as a whole. We find them selecting out a few as worthy of the highest good and condemning the rest to servitude. The hopeless inferiority, the irremediable baseness of the vast mass of men, — this characterizes the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. Rarely do modern philosophers, unless inspired by Christianity, rise to an exalted conception of man.

The history of ethics confirms this view. What did Christianity add to ethics considered as a science? It added, says Professor Sidgwick in his "History of Ethics," benevolence. That is not found in pre-Christian philosophy. Let me read you a few sentences from Professor Sidgwick's work: "It is . . . in the impulse given to practical beneficence in all its forms, by the exaltation of love as the root of all virtues, that the most important influence of Christianity on the particulars of civilized morality is to be found. . . . This development clearly appears when we compare the different post-Socratic systems of ethics. In Plato's exposition of the different virtues *there is no mention whatever of benevolence*, although his

writings show a keen sense of the importance of friendship as an element of philosophic life, especially of the intense personal affection naturally arising between master and disciple. Aristotle goes somewhat further in recognizing the moral value of friendship (φιλιά); and although he considers that in its highest form it can only be realized by the fellowship of the wise and good, he yet extends the notion so as to include the domestic affections, and takes notice of the importance of mutual kindness in binding together all human societies. Still, in his formal statement of the different virtues, positive benevolence is only discernible under the notion of 'liberality,' in which form its excellence is hardly distinguishable from graceful profusion in self-regarding expenditure. Cicero, on the other hand, in his treatise on external duties (officia) ranks the rendering of positive services to other men as an important department of social duty; while in later stoicism the recognition of the universal fellowship and natural claims of human beings as such is sometimes expressed with so much warmth of feeling as to be hardly distinguishable from Christian philanthropy.* Nor was this regard for humanity merely a doctrine of the school. Partly through the influence of Stoic and other Greek philosophy, partly from the general expansion of human sympathies, the legislation of the Empire during the first three centuries shows a steady development

in the direction of natural justice and humanity; and some similar progress may be traced in the tone of common moral opinion. Still, the utmost point that this development reached fell considerably short of the standard of Christianity. The Christian religion made benevolence a form of divine service, and identified 'piety' with 'pity.'"

You see the difference even in Professor Sidgwick's account, and this hardly dwells sufficiently on the difference — it scarcely brings it out in its full significance.

You at once perceive the effect of Christianity in the systems of ethics which took their origin after the diffusion of Christianity throughout the civilized world. You find in the best of these the duty to love and serve one's fellows clearly indicated, and in the utilitarian school of ethics you discover a view nearly as strict as the Christian; but in reading an account of the various ethical systems, I have the feeling that they leave me suspended in the air. They lack a firm, sure basis, and rest finally on assumption. They struggle for a foothold, but do not find one, and they can in their claims never go beyond Christian ethics. When you accept Christ you find in the command to love your neighbor as yourself, a standing-ground from which you can clearly develop an ethical system, and it is this which will reveal to us points of view to show us the relations which ought to subsist between the Church and the world.

It was this fundamental ethical view of Christ and His apostles which at once led them to the heart of the social questions of their time.

But it was not merely on ethical systems that Christian teaching firmly impressed itself. Christian benevolence moulded legislation, as has been finely shown by the great jurist of Göttingen, Professor von Ihering. Christian benevolence existed, and it sought expression in every department of social life, and finally it became possible to create benevolent corporations, corporations designed to relieve suffering man and to elevate humanity. It was not until the fourth or fifth century after Christ that such an independent benevolent foundation as the Hopkins Hospital of Baltimore could exist, and the change of legislation which made it possible was due to a distinct Christian influence.[1]

When we inquire into the consequences of this notion that Christianity has chiefly to do with another world and not with the establishment of righteous relations and the development of character in this world, we shall find an explanation of the aberrations of the Church.[2] Is it not this error which has made persecutions possible, nay inevitable? If it is our place through Christ to

[1] See Ihering's *Zweck im Recht*, Bd. I., ss. 285–91.

[2] In Part III. I say that the errors of the Church may be traced to an exaltation of theology and neglect of sociology. The two statements are not inconsistent.

redeem this world, to make men better and happier while on earth, it is evident that we will not accomplish that purpose by torturing them, burning them at the stake and burying them alive. If, however, the Church has to do with a series of propositions in regard to religion and finds its mission in inducing men to accept these propositions, in order to pluck them from a flaming hell of eternal torment, it is quite natural that good and pious men should be willing to inflict what are after all comparatively insignificant tortures to rescue men from unending death and damnation.

We find in this view likewise an explanation of the separation between right life and religion, which before the Reformation became such a scandal to the Church of God, and which is still so sad a spectacle. Some have gone so far as to make salvation consist in ceremonies, obedience to the dictates of priestcraft, in some sort of magic, or in a feeling of the emotional nature, and as stated, even in intellectual assent to a species of metaphysics. What have all these things to do with conduct? We can see the logical outcome of certain doctrines in extreme manifestations. So I think the experiences of a friend of mine, a Presbyterian minister who lives in Baltimore, show the real meaning of doctrines to which even now some are inclined to cling. This gentleman attended a meeting of negroes when the

minister was exhorting his flock to get religion, and telling them if they but got religion — but I will give the rest in his own words, which were as follows: —

> "You may rip and t'yar,
> You kin cuss and swar,
> But you jess as sure of heaven
> As ef you done d'yar."

We may consider the labor movement and the broader social questions in the light of what has been said.

The complaint made by American workingmen against the churches is that they fail to influence conduct, that they fail to impress their fundamental principles upon those who give direction to the practical affairs of life in the counting-room, in legislative halls, and on the bench, although these mighty men profess Christianity. Laboring men do not feel that it is necessarily better to work for a Christian than one who denies the obligations of Christianity — the outcome of experience has not taught them that such is the case; they do not believe that Church membership on the part of their landlord insures just and considerate treatment for his tenants; they do not flock to the merchants who acknowledge Christ as their Master, in the conviction that they will merely on that account receive of them honest goods for a fair price; they do not rejoice when they learn that a railroad magnate, in whose employ thou-

sands of their number stand, is regularly attending an orthodox church; they do not anticipate in consequence a removal of the truck-stores which rob them, nor the shortening of a working day, inhuman in its length, dangerous alike to patrons and employés; on the contrary, they greet the news that one of their oppressors has allied himself with the Church, with mocking laughter. I do not know that I have ever yet seen in a real American workingman's paper any objections urged to the doctrines of Christianity, nor do I ever remember to have seen a word against Christ, who is, indeed, often lauded in the same breath in which churches are condemned. I may have seen some arguments directed against the fundamental principles of Christianity in American labor papers printed in a foreign language, but even in them I think it will be invariably found that they mainly take issue with Christianity as seen in the lives of its professors in their every-day affairs; as seen both in what they do and in what they do not do. It may, however, be asked why workingmen should be peculiarly alive to the absence of righteous principles in the business world. The answer is easy. They feel more keenly than others every departure from righteousness. We who are in temporal concerns more fortunate have, as the saying is, more at stake in the existing industrial organization. The ties which bind us to things as they are, are

far stronger, because things as they are, are more profitable to us. Many of us, directly or indirectly, derive profit from even acknowledged abuses, which are a part of things as they are. To correct these abuses would often involve serious sacrifice for us who are more fortunate. I think this must also be confessed: The more prosperous we become, the more deeply are we rooted in things as they are. Insensibly our interests ramify and take hold in a thousand and one ways of the existing social order. At the same time it is not only workingmen who are driven from the churches by what is considered an unfortunate relation of the Church and the world, but high-minded men of fortune and education, superior to the fortunes and education of the masses; men whose sensitive natures are outraged by the unrebuked wickedness of the world. Among the estranged we count then large numbers who stand at the foot of the social ladder, and some among the best who stand near the top.

How does a thinking workingman, how must a thinking workingman feel about the attitude of the Church in the past? An attitude, which, if it is rapidly changing for the better, is still frequently seen. I think I can best tell you by quotations from Hodder's "Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury." You all know who the Earl of Shaftesbury was: an earnest Christian man, who tried to serve God in all relations of

life, and who perhaps did more for wage-earners in England than any man who has lived during the present century. Now, if the indifference, coldness, hostility, of the Church, to which he was always loyal, grieved even a man of his exalted rank, how would a workingman without the advantages of such social eminence feel? For the full maglignity of the enemies of the Earl of Shaftesbury could not reach him as it would have reached a humbler man. I give you long quotations from his diary which are the spontaneous outpouring of his heart.

"I find that evangelical religionists are not those on whom I can rely. The factory question, and every question for what is called 'humanity,' receive as much support from 'the men of the world' as from men who say they will have nothing to do with it."[1]

"No stir as yet in behalf of my 'Children's Employment Commission.' I cannot discern how, humanly speaking, I have ever made any progress at all. To whom should I have naturally looked for the chief aid? Why, undoubtedly, to the clergy, and especially those of the trading districts. Quite the reverse; from them I have

[1] Works of Earl of Shaftesbury, Vol. I., p. 300. Diary, July 4, 1840. The measures to which reference is made in these quotations are all measures in behalf of the public welfare, chiefly, if not exclusively, measures in behalf of working children and women.

received no support, or next to none; one or two, in their individual capacity, have given me encouragement, and wished me God speed, but as a body, or even numerously, though singly, they have done, are doing, and will do, nothing. And this throughout my whole career. There are grand and blessed exceptions; thank God for them! Bickersteth is a jewel, a jewel of the first water; one of those that God will 'make up,' so we read in Malachi, at the last day. The only public act in behalf of these wretched infants, was a petition signed by fifty of the clergy in the neighborhood of Bristol, got up by the amiable exertions of the Rev. Sir Henry Montagu; and yet we have in our Church, beside prelates, sixteen thousand ordained ministers of Christ's gospel." [1]

". . . The clergy here,[2] as usual, are cowered by capital and power. I find none 'who cry aloud and spare not'; but so it is everywhere. Two more clergymen, I am happy to say, in other parts, have offered me assistance, — Mr. Sparks Byers and Archdeacon Wilberforce; Mr Byers has been singularly active and friendly." [3]

Referring to the workingmen who attended a meeting at Leeds, he says:

". . . 'They love the monarchy and they love religion.' It is most correct, though they have

[1] The Life and Work of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Vol. I., p. 325, Jan. 5, 1841. [2] Manchester.

[3] Ib. Vol. I., p. 346, Aug. 2, 1841.

been denied the blessings of the one and excluded from the benefits of the other. O God, the God of all righteousness, mercy, and love, give us all grace and strength to conceive and execute whatever may be for Thine honor and their welfare, that we may become at the last, through the merits and intercession of our common Redeemer, a great and happy, because a wise and understanding people."[1]

"Last night pushed the bill through committee; a feeble and discreditable opposition! 'Sinners' were with me, 'saints' against me — strange contradiction in human nature."[2]

"Bill passed through the committee last night. In this work, which should have occupied one hour, they spent nearly six, and left it far worse than they found it; never have I seen such a display of selfishness, frigidity to every human sentiment, such ready and happy self-delusion. Three bishops only present, Chichester (Gilbert), Norwich (Stanley), Gloucester (Monk), who came late, but he intended well. The Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury went away! It is my lot, should I, by God's grace live so long, to be hereafter among them;[3] but may He avert the day on which my means of utility in public life would be forever concluded!"[4]

[1] The Life and Work of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Vol. I., p. 346, Aug. 6, 1841. [2] Ib. Vol. I., p. 426, June 23, 1842.
[3] That is among the Lords. [4] Ib. Vol. I., p. 431.

"Prepared as I am, I am oftentimes distressed and puzzled by the strange contrasts I find; support from infidels and non-professors; opposition or coldness from religionists or declaimers!

"I find, as usual, the clergy are, in many cases, frigid; in some few, hostile. So it has ever been with me. At first I could get *none;* at last I have obtained a few, but how miserable a proportion of the entire class! The ecclesiastics as a mass are, perhaps, as good as they can be under any institution of things where human nature can have full swing; but they are timid, time-serving, and great worshippers of wealth and power. I can scarcely remember an instance in which a clergyman has been found to maintain the cause of laborers in the face of pewholders."[1]

"In few instances did any mill-owner appear on the platform with me; in still fewer the ministers of any religious denomination, at first not one except the Rev. Mr. Bull, of Brierly, near Bradford; and even to the last, very few: so cowed were they (or in themselves so indifferent) by the overwhelming influence of the cotton lords. . . . I had more aid from the medical than the divine profession."[2]

"Good-Friday. This is a serious contemplation. Is the world better than the day our blessed Lord died upon the cross? Are men individually bet-

[1] The Life and Work of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Vol. II., p. 76.
[2] Ib. Vol. II., p. 209.

ter? Is the world collectively better? That the externals of society are more refined, that the surface is smoother, that more pious things are said, that more pious actions are tolerated, that civilization has been advanced, and that Christianity is the cause of it, few persons will deny. But how are the hearts of men? Are they cleaner, less averse from good, more given to God? Is the number of the faithful increased, diminished, or stationary? Are we nearer to be an acceptable people? Is there as yet any appearance of a harvest? . . . I trace much of our evil to the moral condition of our ecclesiastical rulers and ministers. It is possible that they may be improved in comparison of former days; they are wholly insufficient in reference to the present. Look to the metropolis! Why so frightful a state of spiritual destitution? Why so many wretched, forsaken, naked vagrants?"[1]

How does Christ save us? In what sense is Christianity to be regarded as a cure for all social troubles? I have always been much impressed by a sermon of Rev. Mark Guy Pearse, in which he said that man had been placed in the world to save it. This is true. God has given to His people this world for salvation. The world appeared to be drifting away from God, but Christ came and proclaimed the truth, revealing to us God, and then left His disciples to preach the gospel to all creatures, promising them that they

[1] The Life and Work of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Vol. II., p. 280.

should do greater works than He had done. It is now for us to save the world with the help of the Divine Spirit, which Christ sent to us as Comforter. But let it never be forgotten that Salvation means infinitely more than the proclamation of glittering generalities and the utterance of sweet sentimentalities. Salvation means righteousness, positive righteousness, in all the earth, and its establishment means hard warfare. The "Church militant" is something more than a phrase, or the Church itself is a mockery. Preaching the gospel means going to men with the words, "Thou, thou, art the man." It means a never-ceasing attack on every wrong institution, until the earth becomes a new earth, and all its cities, cities of God.

It is as truly a religious work to pass good laws, as it is to preach sermons; as holy a work to lead a crusade against filth, vice, and disease in slums of cities, and to seek the abolition of the disgraceful tenement-houses of American cities, as it is to send missionaries to the heathen. Even to hoe potatoes and plant corn ought to be regarded, and must be regarded by true Christians, as religious acts; and all legislators, magistrates, and governors are as truly ministers in God's Church as any bishop or archbishop.

I will now mention, without any attempt at scientific classification, some of the subjects which, it seems to me, ought to be taken up by the Church, — all of them religious subjects: —

1. Child labor — a growing evil — diminishing in other countries, increasing in this, removing children from home at a tender age, ruining them morally, dwarfing them physically and mentally.

2. The labor of women under conditions which imperil the family. These are the facts about child-labor, and the number of women wage-earners, as gathered by my friend, Dr. E. W. Bemis, and published in his article on Workingmen in the United States, in the American edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica: —

"The number of males over sixteen engaged in manufacturing in 1880 was 2,019,035, an increase in ten years of 24.97 per cent. The number of females over fifteen was 531,639, an increase in the same time of 64.2 per cent, and of children 181,921, an increase of 58.79 per cent. . . . The employment of women in all gainful occupations is increasing fifty per cent faster than the population, or than the employment of men, and the same is true to still greater degree of the employment of children, save in the very few states which have stringent factory laws and make any genuine effort to enforce them."

To show the effect of good laws properly enforced, it may be mentioned that in Massachusetts, the banner state of the Union in labor legislation, — although still behind England, — it has been found possible to diminish child-labor by seventy per cent.

3. Sunday labor, an increasing evil, against which workingmen throughout the length and breadth of the land are crying out bitterly. Their papers abound in complaint. A mass meeting has been held in Chicago to agitate against Sunday slavery. What an opportunity for the Church! And remember, that the spirit of the fourth commandment means that a man should have one day in seven free, if he cannot by any possibility (street-car drivers, *e.g.*) have Sunday. The spirit of the institution of Sunday has in too many instances departed, and it has been forgotten that Sunday has been made for man. Some people talk as if in Sunday observances they were conferring a favor on God. Sunday is to too many a merely arbitrary matter, just as if God had commanded us in entering a room always to enter with the left foot foremost. Thus we have actually had controversies as to whether we should observe Saturday or Sunday, as if it made the slightest difference. So frivolous have become many things with which at least some Christians concern themselves. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." There are also those who imagine that, if it is really necessary for them to work their employés on Sunday, they do not break the fourth commandment in compelling them to work also on all other days of the week. It is one of the best features of the programme of the American Sabbath Union that they

contemplate agitation for a six-day law, which shall make it illegal to contract for more than six days' work in seven. Such a law ought to be accompanied with adequate provisions against subterfuges and with severe penalties for disobedience. It is thoroughly Christian in spirit. It will also test the sincerity of those who claim that Sunday work is a necessity.

5. Playgrounds and other provision for healthful recreation in cities — an antidote to the saloon and other forms of sin.

6. Removal of children from parents who have ceased to perform the duties of parents. Homes, real homes, should be found for these.

7. Public corruption, — about which let us have something precise and definite. The moral iniquity of city councilmen, who accept street-car passes, of writers for the press, of legislators and judges, who accept railroad passes, might profitably be treated under this head.

8. Saturday half-holidays, — a great moral reform which has been accomplished in England, where men work but fifty-four hours a week. N.B. England, with short hours, is of all countries most dreaded in international competition. Some of you will point to New York, but I say the experiment has never been honestly tried in New York. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that it is not enough merely to assist in securing leisure. It is necessary to show peo-

ple how to *use leisure*. This, like other things, must be taught by precept and example.

9. A juster distribution of wealth. Under this head a refutation of those ridiculous persons who would have us believe that wage-earners now receive nine-tenths of all the wealth produced — quackery and jugglery which must delight Satan.

10. A manly contest against the deadly optimism of the day which aims to retard improvement and to blind men to actual dangers. After careful thought and observation, I believe the social consequences of optimism even more disastrous than those of pessimism, though both are bad enough. Less spread-eagleism in America, more repentance for national sins, *e.g.* the most corrupt city governments to be found in the civilized world.

What is the extent of our obligations? It is measured by nothing less than our capacity — everything must be devoted to the service of humanity. The old Mosaic ten-per-cent rule was given for the hardness of men's hearts. We now live under a hundred-per-cent rule. The early Church understood this very well, and, as Professor Sidgwick says in the book to which I have already referred, in the view of the Church "the mere ownership of wealth as such gave a Christian no moral right to its enjoyment. This right could only be given by real need." Listen to the words of St. Ambrose in answer to the question, "What

injustice is there in my diligently preserving my own, so long as I do not invade the property of others?" "Shameless saying. My *own*, sayest thou? What is it? From what sacred place hast thou brought it into the world? . . . That which is taken by thee beyond what would suffice to thee, is taken by violence. . . . Thou, then, who hast received the gifts of God, thinkest thou thou committest no injustice by keeping to thyself alone what would be the means of life to many? . . . It is the bread of the hungry thou keepest; it is the clothing of the naked thou lockest up; the money thou buriest is the redemption of the wretched." [1]

It is not the doctrine of asceticism which I would preach. Asceticism is self-sacrifice for its own sake, and that is not what Christ would have. Christianity means self-sacrifice for the sake of others, and would not curtail innocent enjoyment.

I have said that I am bound to use my all for the sake of humanity, but it is my right and my duty to remember that humanity includes myself, — I am one of the great whole, humanity. I must develop my own faculties and seek the perfection of my powers. So I may use time and resources for myself — yet not for myself, for all my faculties so perfected must be consecrated. When it

[1] Quoted from Ashley's English Economic History, pp. 126, 127.

comes to economic resources, a Christian spirit will tell us what we can devote to our needs. Sometimes it may be even more than nine-tenths, perhaps nineteen-twentieths; sometimes less than one-tenth, perhaps only one-twentieth.

I would that I could speak to you of many topics. One aspect of the relief of the poor and degraded I should like to present. We are — I say it in all reverence — saviours of men; otherwise we are not followers of Christ. Now, as Christ gave up all the glories of heaven, may it not be the duty of many of us to give up our pleasures and go and live among those who need brightness, light, joy, and by personal contact, help to lift them to a higher plane? I think this is one of the lessons we can learn from Tolstoi's book "What to Do." We must come into real, living contact, into a sort of oneness with people before we can give to them and receive from them needed help. The history of charity abundantly teaches us this lesson. Some few are doing this. We have Father Huntington in New York, the devoted Episcopal home missionary. We have others living in the poor quarters of our cities, especially some zealous young men and women, apostles of humanity, who deserve honor. We have the university settlement, Toynbee Hall in London. All this is but a beginning.

I should like to say something about Christian principles in money-getting as well as in money-

spending, for it is in many respects more important. Some are willing to impoverish men in their money-getting and then to support them with alms. In the advertisements of the Louisiana Lottery Company we read that it contributes liberally to the support of charitable and philanthropic institutions. Mockers of God!

I would also gladly speak about our charitable institutions, our almshouses, our asylums, etc., of which we boast so loudly as proof of our Christianity. Did it ever occur to you that when these become too numerous, they are in a sense our disgrace and reproach? They are, if they show that we have neglected preventive measures which could have avoided the serious social evils which these institutions are designed to mitigate.

I regret that I must pass over the Christian doctrine of the State, and of the source of its authority, and that I cannot speak of the moral aspects of the contract theory of the State which Rousseau and the French Revolution sent us, thereby implanting seeds of anarchy. Our prayer-books tell us that those in authority are ministers of God, but to most of us this seems an idle phrase, and in our view of the State we have fallen below an old heathen philosopher like Socrates.

We are talking much about Robert Elsmere in these days. The only reply to Robert Elsmere is the Christian life, and I would commend to you, especially to those of you who are parents, still

more particularly to those of you who are wealthy parents, the following words taken from an address of the Earl of Shaftesbury to young men. They may save you much sorrow.

"Depend upon it, the time will come when you will bless God if your career has been one by which your fellows have been benefited and God honored. Nothing is more likely to keep you from mischief of all kinds, from mischief of action, of speculation — from every mischief that you can devise, than to be everlastingly engaged in some great practical work of good. Christianity is not a state of opinion and speculation. Christianity is essentially practical, and I will maintain this, that practical Christianity is the greatest curer of corrupt speculative Christianity."

Time fails me. In parting let me repeat my thought in two phrases: first, the world as the subject of redemption; second, thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth.

III.

PHILANTHROPY.

PHILANTHROPY.

At the request of the Charity Organization Society several gentlemen have agreed to write a series of articles on the administration of charity in various countries, and I have been asked to contribute an introductory paper. This I am glad to do, because I believe that the question of charity is one which needs thorough discussion at the present time. It is scarcely necessary to say that no subject can well be more important. An unwise administration of charity tends to pauperize the masses and to impoverish the nation; wisely given relief, on the contrary, will rapidly diminish pauperism and will cure large numbers of this horrible and loathsome disease.

I have decided to write down a few thoughts on the general subject of philanthropy, which includes charity, as ordinarily understood, as a subdivision.

I.

Philanthropy is the dynamics of Christianity; that is to say, it is Christianity in action. Christianity minus philanthropy is not Christianity at

all. On the contrary, it is a monstrosity. It is superstition, persecution, and cruelty. It is worship of the devil, and not God's service. A man who claims to be a Christian and is not at the same time a philanthropist is a hypocrite and a liar. Jacques Ferrand is the villain of Eugene Sue's "Mysteries of Paris." He oppresses the poor and ruins young girls. Before people know all his crimes, they say of him he is hard, grinding, exacting, but "do you observe how devout he is? how regular in his attendance on church?" His long prayers are regarded as a partial excuse for his atrocities, but in reality they do but damn him the more deeply. "God will not be mocked."

Love to God is piety, and the science which deals with this part of the gospel is called theology.

Love to man is philanthropy, and the science which deals with this part of the gospel is called sociology. The two are inseparable. The attempt to sever them is like parting the Siamese twins — both die.

The errors and troubles of the Christian Church in the past find their chief explanation in the exaltation of theology and the neglect of sociology. The exclusive cultivation of theology leads to dogma, and dogma produces dissensions and mutual hatred. Christ said, on the other hand, that he who should do the will of God would know of the doctrine. Life and action lead to truth, and truth means unity. In reading the biographies of

eminent philanthropists, I have been impressed with this fact: those who do God's will rather than talk about God's will, come very close to their fellow-men. Perhaps no better illustration of this is afforded than by the biography of that eminent man, the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. As I am an Episcopalian, it will not be considered as aimed against that body of Christians, when I remark that he was brought up as an exclusive and bigoted adherent of the Church of England. He thought it a "meritorious thing to hate dissenters," and relates that once when reading a book it suddenly struck him "the writer must have been a rank dissenter," and he shut up the book, "recoiling from it as he would from rank poison." Later we find this same man working in Exeter Hall meetings and revival services with Christians of all denominations, we read of his friendship for Mr. Spurgeon and of the assistance which he rendered Mr. Moody.

Piety has acquired in many ears a hateful sound, because, separated from philanthropy, it has become a sham, and of all shams none is more hideous than pretended piety. Perhaps nothing in the New Testament is more marked than the manner in which Christ emphasizes philanthropy as if aware — as indeed He must have been — of the tendency to prefer everything else to that. Lip service, long prayers, sound belief, — all these Christ found in abundance, but life was wanting. The Sermon on

the Mount opens with the inculcation of inward and spiritual virtues, meekness, pureness of heart, poorness in spirit, sorrow for sins, but among the beatitudes we find mention of the merciful and the peacemakers; and then Christ turns to his disciples and directs their attention away from themselves to their fellow-men, "Ye are the salt of the earth." . . . "Ye are the light of the world." . . . "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works." Thus is it always — Christ turns the thoughts away from self.

There appears to be a great awakening to the truths which have been here so inadequately outlined, yet there seems to be a danger ahead of us. It should be remembered that philanthropy is not mere sentimentality. Philanthropy is not gush, and we must take heed that our talk does not end in vague and glittering generalities.

Philanthropy must be grounded in profound sociological studies. Otherwise, so complex is modern society that in our efforts to help man we may only injure him. Not all are capable of research in sociology, but the Church should call to her service in this field the greatest intellects of the age. The seminaries which train ministers of religion should be great leaders of thought in economic and social studies. It is the office of philanthropists gifted with insight and blessed with means, to encourage such studies by the

foundation of prizes, professorships, and publication funds.

One of the most useful books in recent times is Fremantle's work "The World as the Subject of Redemption." It indicates the whole scope and purpose of philanthropy. Philanthropy embraces the individual, the family, the community, the state, the nation, and finally humanity.

Philanthropy with respect to the time-element is of two kinds, positive and preventive. Philanthropy may also be divided into two kinds with respect to the agencies employed; namely, voluntary and coercive. Let us examine briefly these various kinds of philanthropy.

Preventive philanthropy anticipates harm and stops it. This is the best kind of philanthropy. A few illustrations may make the meaning of this kind of philanthropy clearer. It is meritorious to build hospitals and reformatories. It is far better to diminish the need of these institutions. Child labor is a cause of poverty, disease, and crime. To abolish child labor, to replace it by intellectual, moral, and industrial training, to restrict the labor of young people within the limit prescribed by physiology and hygiene, to pass laws compelling employers to fence in dangerous machinery, and to watch over the enforcement of these laws, — all this is philanthropy of a higher type.

The collection of fresh-air funds, sending poor children to the country, is a showy kind of philan-

thropy and does some good. This is not to be underrated or despised. It is far better, however, to assist in the passage and enforcement of sanitary laws, giving the children all the year round clean, wholesome streets to live in, and healthful lodgings, and thus rendering less necessary the spasmodic and irregular gifts which after all send comparatively few for a short time away from wretched slums. Charity organization societies are excellent, but far better is philanthropy which keeps men and women from becoming paupers.

Preventive philanthropy makes less noise in the world and builds fewer visible monuments to gratify pride than positive philanthropy. It also implies a watchful love to foresee evil. It requires a higher degree of self-renunciation. It is the kind of philanthropy especially commended by Christ. It acts not for the praise of men. It passes often unseen by men, and when perceived is frequently little admired. Indeed, philanthropy of this kind often brings curses from men rather than blessings. The history of English labor during the first fifty years of this century offers a good illustration. Men, women, and children were being consumed in the manufacturing establishments of Great Britain. Flesh and blood were turned into bright gold by long, weary hours in overheated, poorly ventilated factories, or in mines underground. Accidents, easily preventable, were of daily occurrence. This was the time of which Mrs. Browning sang in "The Cry of the Children."

"Our blood splashes upward, O gold heaper,
And your purple shows your path,
But the child's sob in the silence curses deeper,
Than the strong man in his wrath."

Now only praise was meted out to those who built hospitals and doled out alms to the human refuse of the mines and factories; but when Christian men stepped forward and said, "The strong arm of the law must protect children who cannot help themselves, and the industry of England must cease to destroy human beings, and to turn out human refuse on society; cannibalism shall exist no longer in England," then these men took upon themselves a cross indeed, the cross of a long and bitter fight against all the hosts of Mammon.

A study of philanthropy shows that Christ meant what He said in His social teaching. Doubtless Tolstoï falls far short of the truth, but certainly he has done good service in emphasizing the teachings of Christ. The cry of philanthropy should be, "Back to Christ."

Positive philanthropy aims to cure existing evils. It enters after the harm is done and attempts, so far as may be, to undo it. It gathers up the fragments that nothing further may be wasted. It leaves the ninety and nine sheep in the fold and goes after the one lost sheep. It is a sacred duty to do this, and the superiority of prevention to cure must not detract from the glory of men who are engaged in this kind of work.

Insane asylums, charity organizations societies, and reformatories may be mentioned. The penal code may even be described as philanthropy of this kind.

Society's action has hitherto been to far too great an extent *merely* positive. The state appears to large classes as merely a power which hems in and punishes. The permanence of civilization will be secured by the substitution of preventive for positive action by governments. It is all very well to hang anarchists. It is better so to educate the young, so to purify politics, so to build up the home, so to reform our business methods as to take the standing-ground out from under the anarchists.

Philanthropy may in its methods be voluntary. It may be exercised by individuals in their individual capacity or by associations of individuals freely banded together. A large part of our philanthropy is of this kind and always must be.

Coercive philanthropy is philanthropy of governments, either local, state, or national. The exercise of philanthropy is coming to an increasing extent to be regarded as the duty of government. It was because this was to so large a degree recognized by the old Hebrew state, says Fremantle, in his "World as the Subject of Redemption," that the Jews rejoiced in their law. This law was the protection of the weak and needy, the safety of the fatherless, the bulwark of the helpless, the

refuge of the oppressed. Well sings the Psalmist of the God-given law of Israel: "The delight of the righteous is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." No room for anarchy there! Imagine any one singing thus of — well, let us say the Code Napoleon.

Coercive philanthropy must rest on voluntary philanthropy. Neither one alone is sufficient. This is one of the most useful lessons to be learned from English factory legislation. Men like Gladstone, Macaulay, Sir James Graham, and J. A. Roebuck, who had opposed it, all lived to acknowledge their mistake, and some recanted very handsomely. The conclusion of all was well summed up in these words by Mr. Roebuck in 1860: "We ought never trust to the justice and humanity of men whose interests are furthered by injustice and cruelty. The slave-owner in America, the manufacturer in England, though they may be individually good men, will, nevertheless, as slave-owners and masters, be guilty of atrocities at which humanity shudders."

A few words should be said about the economic possibilities of philanthropy. It is possible to introduce righteousness in our daily life. In a sermon at Chautauqua, the Rev. Dr. Bashford recently said that a Young Men's Christian Association in one of our cities had after debate decided that it was impossible to do business on Christian principles. Professor Henry C. Adams,

one of the most thoughtful economists in the country, in his monograph, "Relation of the State to Industrial Action," has raised this question: Does not all the preaching about the necessity of righteousness in business simply make men worse? The argument is that as the business world is constituted at present, men must commit sin, and to point out to them their sinfulness, but awakens a sense of guilt and increases their sinfulness. Now this is a question with which Christian philanthropy is concerned.

The business life of men is the basis of all social life, and if the foundation is faulty, the superstructure must be imperfect. Whatever inherent wrongs there are in our industrial life are capable of correction; and Professor Adams has himself, in the same monograph to which reference has been made, offered fruitful suggestions with this end in view.

Sufficient goods to satisfy all rational wants of all men can be produced. The problem of production has been solved, that of distribution awaits its solution. Theodore Hertzka has recently made some most interesting investigations.[1] He calculates that in the civilized nations of the earth the recent inventions and discoveries — especially the application of steam to industry — can do twelve times as much physical work as all the men living in these nations. In other words, it is just the same

[1] In his *Gesetze der Sozialen Entwickelung.*

as if twelve slaves were working for every man, or sixty for every family, whereas in ancient Athens, there were only ten slaves for an Athenian family. He estimates further that a sufficient supply of goods for a family can be produced by sixty days' labor of one man, and that at present a laboring man's family consumes only one-tenth of that which he is capable of producing.

II.

There are several things which ought to be very clear to those who desire to give practical manifestation to their love for their fellow-men. First and foremost is some kind of an idea of what can be rationally contemplated as a possible future for the masses. There should, in the second place, be diligent inquiry as to the means which may be used to assist the masses to attain this highest economic, intellectual, and ethical elevation. From neglect of the first consideration philanthropists have frequently endeavored to encourage people to reach an unattainable ideal. From a failure to reflect with care on ways and means they have unfortunately at times injured those whom they longed to serve.

One ideal is expressed in the first message of Abraham Lincoln to Congress, in these words: —

"There is not of necessity any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed in that condition

for life. Many independent men, everywhere in these States, a few years back in their lives were hired laborers. The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another beginner to help him."

Another ideal for the vast majority is expressed by Charles Kingsley, in these words: —

"I do not think the cry 'get on' to be anything but a devil's cry. The moral of my book ["Alton Locke"] is that the workingman who tries to get on, to desert his class and rise above it, enters into a lie, and leaves God's path for his own — with consequences.

"Second, I believe that a man might be, as a tailor or a costermonger, every inch of him a saint and a scholar and a gentleman, for I have seen some few such already. I believe hundreds of thousands would be so if their business were put on a Christian footing, and themselves given by education, sanitary reforms, etc., the means of developing their own latent capabilities. I think the cry 'rise in life' has been excited by the very increasing impossibility of being anything but brutes while they struggle below. I believe from experience that when you put workmen into human dwellings and give them a Christian education, so far from wishing discontentedly to rise out of their class or level others to it, exactly the

opposite takes place. They become sensible of the dignity of work, and they begin to see their labor as a true calling in God's church, now that it is cleared from the *accidentia* which made it look in their eyes only a soulless drudgery in a devil's workshop of a world."

Which is the correct ideal — that of Lincoln or that of Kingsley? Both are somewhat extreme, but there can be no doubt that Kingsley showed a far better comprehension of the nature of industrial society than did the great American statesman. Only comparatively few can rise to positions of eminence, because eminence means the existence of a mass lower down — a majority not eminent. It is a relative conception. Can every tree in a forest be higher than all other trees? Just so absurd is it to expect every one to attain wealth or prominence in professional or literary pursuits. Every railway president necessitates the existence of several thousand wage-receivers; every bank president presupposes clerks, bookkeepers, and others in a subordinate position; every merchant of wealth requires numerous salaried employés. By no human possibility can this be otherwise. It is no more impossible that two and two should make five than it is that the many should rise in the ordinary sense of that word. It is not the fault of employers, nor is it due to the thriftlessness of employés. It lies in the nature of things. If you tell a single concrete

workingman on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad that he may yet be president of the company, it is not demonstrable that you have told him what is not true, although it is within bounds to say that he is far more likely to be killed by a stroke of lightning; but it can be mathematically proved that by no amount of diligence, thrift, and intelligence can one out of a thousand employés attain that position. The number of those high places is necessarily very limited in proportion to the entire population. This thought is expressed in different words by a celebrated American divine, the late Dr. William Ellery Channing. He says in the recently published selections from his note-book: "Only a few of the laboring class can rise, for it is by them that any one rises."

It is of the utmost importance that this truth should be fully grasped by all who would assist society. With industry organized as it is now, it is a necessity that the ordinary free hired laborer should be fixed in that condition for life. More than this is true. The number of those who can rise to the top of industrial society relatively diminishes because production is carried on on an increasingly large scale. When the average number of men in each manufacturing establishment is four, one out of four can be at its head; if the average number is ten, only one out of ten can occupy that position. Scarcely any one will be likely to dispute the fact that the industrial move-

ment of the day is towards production on a vast scale. A recently published and correct statement in regard to the milling industry illustrated it. It was to the effect that the number of flouring mills in the United States had recently and rapidly decreased, while the number of barrels of flour produced had increased.

There is a desire to substitute co-operation for our present system of production. Many of the world's best thinkers believe that this change will take place some day, but it seems to be very clear that it can only be brought about as the result of a long course of evolution. Let us, however, suppose that the aims of the co-operators could at once be realized. What would thereby be effected? Undoubtedly this would give to the masses the largest economic welfare that could be attained, for with labor and capital thus united the entire product of industry would accrue to the laboring classes. It would involve an intellectual and ethical training, and would lift up the entire level of society, beginning with the lowest social stratum. It would, however, still be necessary for the vast majority to toil at manual labor, nor can this ever be otherwise.

It is doubtless best that it should not be otherwise. The number engaged in useful toil is now too small, not too large. It seems to me that, simple as all this is, many philanthropists would have made a different disposition of their property if

they had fully understood it. Too frequently we see men shaping their conduct as if the laboring class could be benefited by lifting men out of it. Consequently, we see inducements offered to men to forsake the occupations of the artisan and mechanic and become preachers, doctors, and independent business men. Every newspaper helps to fill the minds of youth with the idea that they ought to become great bankers, manufacturers, or railway presidents, if not presidents of the United States.[1] This they are brought to think is what it means to "rise in life." Then, after filling the mind of the average boy with dreams of unattainable wealth, these same newspapers are astonished to see him turn away in aversion from humble but honorable toil. The doors should be thrown open as widely as possible, and every endeavor should be made to give genuine superiority an opportunity to find a position high up on the social ladder. But let no one imagine that he has conferred a direct benefit on the masses by lifting those born among them above their fellows. The direct effect of a removal of the best talent from among the

[1] A distinguished judge of Baltimore told me that he once visited in company with another gentleman St. Mary's Industrial School near Baltimore. This school is a reformatory for young criminals, but the gentleman who accompanied the judge, in talking to the boys tried to encourage them with the thought that any one of them might become president of the United States. This seems to me to have been more than foolish — to have been almost wicked.

masses is an injury and not a benefit. The following quotation from the novel "Fraternity" brings out this idea: —

"The mistake generally made in helping the poor is the attempt to drag up individuals out of the dark, and a constant struggling up of enlightened spirits from among them. What we want is rather a constant immigration from the brighter spheres to ours, to aid in changing it, not to assist us in quitting it."

If people could have more fully grasped the idea that the vast majority must ever be found in the working classes, so-called, there would have been a more earnest endeavor to render their lot a happier one.

The kind of philanthropy we need is one which will render the life of the ordinary child, the ordinary man, and the ordinary woman both a happier and a better life — a more wholesome life than it is apt to be to-day. This is why I observe with such delight the practical workings of the Enoch Pratt Free Library. Mr. Pratt, as I understand it, did not desire to make merchant princes out of carpenters or blacksmiths, — which might perhaps do them more harm than good, even if it could be accomplished, — but he did wish to render the life of the people of Baltimore, regardless of occupation, richer and fuller, and this he has accomplished. Consequently, I should place Mr. Pratt's benefaction second to none of the institutions with

which philanthropists have blessed our favored city.

What improvement in the lot of the great mass of mankind is possible? It would seem that there is no reason why any member of a civilized community should be excluded from participation in all the blessings of civilization which he can enjoy. To render these blessings accessible to all rather than to make a few rich or distinguished is the office of philanthropy, and it is the duty of public policy to encourage a wide diffusion of the free gifts of nature and of the rich acquisitions handed down to us by past generations. What are the real wants of men as distinguished from their fictitious wants?

First, there is a religious culture, which should be offered by our churches to all freely, rich and poor alike. The full duty of the churches will never be done so long as church privileges are sold for money. "Without money and without price" should be the motto of every Christian church in tendering its privileges. As I take it, a gift of the largest possible sum, a hundred thousand dollars, a year, if you please, entitles one to no privileges whatever, nor does inability to contribute a dollar a year work a forfeiture of any privileges in the house of God.

Ethical culture must come chiefly through religion, but not wholly. It should not be separated from schools of any grade, and should be supplied

by good literature. A wholesome environment is a great aid to ethical culture. It is difficult to attain a high plane of life in the atmosphere of the slums of our great cities. But these are blots on our civilization, and can and should be abolished. The good work has already been begun in many quarters, and it will never cease until it is complete. Here also is an opportunity for public authority and private philanthropy to find a field. It is not necessary to make a gift in this case; frequently it may not be even desirable. Good, comfortable houses can be built for the laboring classes by associations, and rented so as to yield at least four per centum net on the investment. A gentleman in Brooklyn, who has done a good work in providing houses for the poor, receives six per centum net. English ladies and a few American ladies have done a good work in this field, many of them collecting the rents so as to form a connection with the tenants and to benefit them by their friendship. Miss Octavia Hill is especially known on this account, and more about her work can be read in the article on "Workingmen's Homes" in *Harper's Monthly* for April, 1884. A walk through our alleys will show that this work is needed in Baltimore. It is needed in every American city.

Intellectual culture is also a right of every human being, and our age for the first time in the world's history is beginning to render it accessible

to all. This must be done by public authority, by co-operation of the people through the agencies of States and their various subdivisions, particularly municipalities. As Hon. J. M. Curry, the agent of the Peabody fund, truthfully asserts: "I am only stating a truism when I say there is not a single instance in all educational history where there has been anything approximating universal education, unless that education has been furnished by government." But if philanthropy is not equal to the task, it can co-operate efficiently with public authority and promote the growth of intellectual culture. I use these words in the largest sense and would include training in the industrial arts and the fine arts. At the present time private efforts might well take the lead in the matter of manual training and help to bring about a time when there shall be no such thing as unskilled labor, but when every man shall be well equipped for some useful occupation. Then for girls there is training in cooking, sewing, and other useful womanly accomplishments which have been too much neglected. Happily something — far too little, however — is already being done in our cities. The work must not be allowed to cease until public authority, which alone can do it, supplies every one with this useful training as supplementary to what is already given in schools. The careful training of all girls, regardless of rank or condition, in womanly accomplishments will

render the home more attractive and wholesome and will hasten the time desired by Kingsley, when it will be easier than now for the ordinary man to be a saint, a scholar, and a gentleman. We have thus taken a hasty glance at religious, intellectual, and ethical culture. It is possible in all these spheres of life to help men to help themselves. A large field is thus offered for philanthropy. It has already accomplished much in this field and is destined to achieve grander triumphs in the future.

Another class of philanthropic work is reached in the case of food and clothing. The test of all true help is this: Does it help people to help themselves? Does it put them on their feet? With respect to education, the answer is in the affirmative; with respect to gifts of food and clothing, it is the exception, when it is not in the negative. Mr. Enoch Pratt might have endowed fifty free soup-houses in the city of Baltimore, instead of founding a free library, but his gift would have been a curse instead of a blessing to us for all future time. Plague, pestilence, and famine together could not work such irreparable harm as fifty free soup-houses. The danger in gifts and clothing is that people will cease to try to exert themselves and will become miserable dependents on the bounty of others, losing their self-respect and manhood. These gifts must then be made with the most extreme caution, and in

saying this I am only giving the result of world-wide experience. Even in this rich land of ours it would not be difficult to increase the number of paupers dependent on the toil of other people to one in fifty of the whole population. This is a very conservative estimate. In certain localities, through unwise administration of charity, the number of paupers has increased until they have numbered one in thirty, one in eighteen, and even one in fifteen of the population. Let us try to think what this means. We speak of the German army as a heavy burden resting on the German people, and so it is; yet large as it is it includes less than one in a hundred of the people.

In Baltimore, as elsewhere, there is reason to believe there are a great many pet paupers connected with our churches and charitable institutions. I believe every clergyman in the city who has given thought to the subject will bear me out in this statement. They hang on year after year and receive support from well-disposed but too often thoughtless people. The office of relief of pauperism is, first, temporary satisfaction of material wants, but secondly, and chiefly, cure of that contagious and disgusting malady. A pet pauper is a monstrosity. If the same person begs food and clothing year after year, it is a sign that those who minister to him fail in their duty. There is always a temptation, to which even the most lovable of the fair sex sometimes yield, "to

pose as Lady Bountiful" among humble dependents. This should always be resisted. The sooner charity puts people on their feet and sends them away, the truer the charity and the more successful its work. The workingmen of Baltimore were some time since trying to start a co-operative shirt factory for the sewing women of our city. I believe thoughtful clergymen will admit that this is a nobler form of charity than the establishment of ten mothers' meetings of a type too common;[1] yet false ideas are so prevalent that many a person would feel more moved by an appeal to buy coal for gratuitous distribution among the poor than by an appeal to buy five dollars' worth of stock in this co-operative enterprise, and thus help these poor women to help themselves, and to become so independent that they would need no further assistance.

There is so much that philanthropy can do to benefit our race that it is a sin to waste money either in doubtful forms of charity or in luxury. In accordance with what has been said, a few general principles can be laid down: —

1. To help the masses, one should improve their surroundings; should assist them to develop their higher faculties, and should open to them all the

[1] It must not be supposed by this that I mean to countenance wholesale condemnation of mothers' meetings. Some of them seem to be doing a good work, but for the most part a reform of some of the features is evidently desirable.

advantages of civilization in proportion to their capacity for enjoyment. One should not try to improve their lot by aiding as many as possible to escape from the conditions under which the masses live. These conditions themselves are to be ameliorated. Those exceptional cases who exhibit evidences of unusual talent of any sort, should be helped and encouraged to develop this for their own sakes, as well as for the sake of society.

2. All help should include effort on the part of those aided. The sooner charity becomes needless and self-help sufficient in each case, the more successful the charity. An excess of help is dangerous. On the other hand, an absence of help may be even more disastrous. John Stuart Mill utters these wise words: "It is even more fatal to exertion to have no hope of succeeding by it than to be assured of succeeding without it. When the condition of any one is so disastrous that his energies are paralyzed by discouragement, assistance is a tonic, not a sedative: it braces instead of deadening the active faculties."

3. Philanthropy, like religion, wants first of all the gift of the heart and soul of those who would do good to others. Unless you give yourself, you cannot help others. To scatter money carelessly, to throw dimes to beggars, will prove a curse to society, and can scarcely be expected to bear a rich harvest of treasures in heaven. Individual treatment and personal contact are needed.

4. Of all charitable and philanthropic effort, that which aims to prevent misery and degradation is most successful. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Children are the ones on whom well-disposed persons and reformers should concentrate their efforts. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that philanthropy should begin its work three hundred years before a man was born, but heredity is beyond the control of society. Environment is not, however, and in the case of the young that is quite as important. Among the things which children need in a city like Baltimore are more breathing-spaces — playgrounds in the heart of the city. Where children have no home, one should be provided, and no pains should be spared to supplement the work of the home. Children cannot protect themselves against parents who neglect to educate or otherwise to do their duty to them. The strong arm of the law must protect them, and law must be supported by Christian effort. Voluntary agencies should co-operate effectually with public agencies to save the children and thereby to diminish the field of repressive philanthropy. Sanitary improvements are good preventive measures for both old and young. Improved dwellings and strict tenement-house laws also aid in giving strong bodies to the race. Postal savings banks, and also municipal savings banks, like those which are doing so good a work in Germany, would have a high value as preventives of

pauperism and promoters of well-being, could they be established. Some employers in making a gift to employés at Christmas time or New Year's give them a bank-book with a sum to their credit. This is the best kind of a present, as it starts men on a road which is hard travelling at first. The highest practicable wages are, of course, desirable, and those who pay their employés good wages are more truly philanthropists than those who cut wages and give largely to chapels for the poor. Co-operation, whenever it has a chance of success, is hopeful and deserves encouragement, as do all honest measures which tend to a wide distribution of wealth.

This article must be closed by one more suggestion. Our Baltimore workingmen need a large hall, a workingmen's institute, let us say — something like the People's Palace described by Walter Besant in that admirable novel "All Sorts and Conditions of Men." When Besant described the People's Palace in his novel, it was purely imaginary, but it is now in process of construction, and an account of the reality is given by the same writer in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1887. I recommend both novel and article as containing more practical political economy than nine-tenths of the economic treatises.

The purpose is to give working people a place, largely under their own control, where they can meet for social purposes and can find rational rec-

reation. Instruction in industrial arts, music, painting, etc., is to be provided to take young people off from the streets and to teach them useful occupations. A workingmen's institute could include also what is found in the very successful Workingmen's College in London, started thirty years ago by Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice, in which laborers have received instruction from men like Ruskin, Sylvester, Seeley, Sheldon Amos, Thomas Hughes, and Sir John Lubbock, not designed to lift them out of the laboring class, but to render their lot in that class a more enviable one. In a building for such an institution provision should by all means be made for halls for all kinds of workingmen's societies and for their political gatherings, that they might not find it necessary to meet in liquor saloons. Reading-rooms and other places for the gathering of men when not at work ought to be another feature. Good music ought likewise to be a prominent feature, for the appreciation of music by the masses and its beneficial effects have frequently been observed by those who are seeking the elevation of society. This one measure would do a great deal to promote temperance. It would also be a complement to the benefactions of Johns Hopkins and Enoch Pratt, and would help to promote that good feeling among all classes which exists already to far greater extent in Baltimore than in any other large American city. The workingmen of Balti-

more feel the need of some large hall of their own. An excursion to Tolchester was given recently in order to raise funds for an "Industrial Hall." The circular advertising the excursion stated that the Knights of Labor desired "to establish a permanent home for labor organizations, as at present many of them are compelled to meet over saloons in uncomfortable halls." What a fine opportunity to do good temperance work and to encourage self-help! This idea was suggested to me by the late Rev. Dr. Leeds, rector of Grace Church, of Baltimore. In a letter dated March 9, 1885, he said this among other things: "There is a fault in the Church in not elevating as she ought — and as she has it in her power to do — the so-called laboring classes, and in promoting in all ranks in life a feeling of brotherhood. . . . It is not through worship alone that we shall reach them; but even more, I believe, by the provision of places of innocent pastime and social intercourse among themselves, free from the dangers of alluring saloons, and yet antidotes to the gloom of unattractive homes in crowded lanes and alleys. Out of them they will pass, under the Church's encouragement, into her places of prayer of their own choice and motion."

IV.

ETHICS AND ECONOMICS.

ETHICS AND ECONOMICS.

In the study of no science is it more important to bear in mind the distinction between words and ideas than in political economy. Locke enforces the far-reaching character of this distinction in general in one of the books of his wonderful work, "Essay on the Human Understanding."

The following personal anecdote is narrated; and so weighty is the truth which it conveys, that it ought to be read frequently and fully grasped: "I was once in a meeting of very learned and ingenious physicians, where by chance there arose a question whether any liquor passed through the filaments of the nerves. I (who had been used to suspect that the greatest part of disputes were more about the signification of words, than a real difference in the conception of things) desired that, before they went any further on in this dispute, they would first establish amongst them what the word 'liquor' signified. . . . They were pleased to comply with my motion, and, upon examination, found that the signification of that word was not so settled and certain as they had all imagined, but that each of them made it a sign

of a different complex idea. This made them perceive that the main of their dispute was about the signification of that term, and that they differed very little in their opinion concerning some fluid and subtile matter passing through the conduits of the nerves, though it was not so easy to agree whether it was to be called 'liquor' or no, — a thing which then each considered he thought it not worth the contending about."

This illustration brings us at once to the heart of a large part of past economic controversies. The same words have stood to different men for different ideas; and in their hot debates about capital, value, money, and the like, they have often been talking about things not at all the same, though they supposed them to be so. One man comes forward with a definition of value, and cries out, "It is of vital importance," as if that would settle all the social problems of the ages, whereas he has simply told us how he intends to use a particular word. He has really accomplished nothing in economics. Having settled upon his signs, he is ready to begin work. I may choose to adopt another definition: what does that signify? Simply this: to me this sign stands for this idea; both may be right, though it is of course important to be consistent, and retain throughout the same sign for the same idea. Another gives a definition for capital, and then says, "To speak of productive capital is mere tautology." — "Of course, my

dear sir," I reply, "the idea of productivity is implied in your definition, but it is not implied in mine. Your proposition, as oftens happens, is a mere repetition of what you already said about capital in your definition; but capital is not a living definite thing, like a horse or a cow. If it were, our difference of definition might imply error; at any rate, a difference of opinion."

Let us take the case of money. One economist ardently maintains that national bank-notes are money; another denies this. Controversy waxes warm; but ask them both to define money, and you shall find that each included his proposition in his definition. It is mere logomachy, nothing more.

One writer — and a very clever one — says, "Value never means utility." That is incorrect. Good writers have used it with that meaning. What he ought to have said is, "According to my definition it can never mean utility."

When we pass over to definitions of political economy, we encounter like divergence of conception, and this explains much controversial writing. The words "political economy" do not convey the same meaning to all persons, nor have they been a sign for an idea which has remained constant in time.

A definition means one of two things, — what is, or what one wishes something to be. What is political economy? We can give an answer which

will describe the various classes of subjects treated under that designation, or we may simply state what we think the term ought to include. The latter course is that which the *doctrinaire* always follows.

Professor Sidgwick, in his "Scope and Method of Economic Science," complains because certain recent writers include "what ought to be" in their political discussion. Does political economy include anything more than what is? Is its province confined to an analysis of existing institutions and the social phenomena of to-day? Here we have to do with a question of fact. What do writers of recognized standing discuss under the heading or title "political economy"? Open your Mill, your Schönberg, your Wagner, your economic magazines, and you readily discern that the course of economic thought is largely, perhaps mainly, directed to what ought to be. It is not, as Professor Sidgwick says, that German economists, in their declamations against egoism, confound what is with what ought to be; for no economists know so well what is, but that they propose to help to bring about what ought to be. This is the reason why the more recent economic thinkers may be grouped together as the "ethical school." They consciously adopt an ethical ideal, and endeavor to point out the manner in which it may be attained, and even encourage people to strive for it.

But this is not all. As has been well pointed out by Professor Giddings, what is includes what ought to be. The ideal exists, but not universally. The ethical aim of reformers is to render general that excellence which at the time is isolated. Past, present, and future are organically connected. The germs of a better future always exist in the present, but they require careful nursing. They do not develop spontaneously.

This establishes a relation between ethics and economics which has not always existed, because the scope of the science has been, as a matter of fact, enlarged. The question is asked, What is the purpose of our economic life? and this at once introduces ethical considerations into political economy. Of course, it is easily possible to enter into a controversy as to the wisdom of this change of conception. Some will maintain that economic science will do well to abide by the conception current at an earlier period in its development, and restrict itself to a discussion of things as they are without regard to past growth or future evolution. The discussion between representatives of these two conceptions would reveal differences of opinion as regards economic facts and economic forces.

Why should economic science concern itself with what ought to be? The answer must include a reference to the nature of our economic life.

This life, as it is understood by representatives of the new school, is not something stationary: it is a growth. What is, is not what has been, nor is it what will be. Movement is uninterrupted; but it is so vast, and we are so much a part of it, that we cannot easily perceive it. It is in some respects like the movement of the earth, which can only be discerned by difficult processes. We are not conscious of it. Although the thought of evolution of economic life had not until recently, I think, been grasped in its full import, yet economists of the so-called older school, like Bagehot and John Stuart Mill, admitted that the doctrines which they received applied only to a comparatively few inhabitants of the earth's surface, and even to them only during a comparatively recent period. In other words, English political economy described the economic life of commercial England in the nineteenth century. Now, a growth cannot well be comprehended by an examination of the organism at one period. The physiologist must know something about the body of the child, of the youth, of the full-grown man, and of the aged man, before he fully understands the nature of the human body. Our biologists, indeed, insist that they must go back to the earliest periods, and trace the development of life-forms forward during all past periods, and they endeavor to point out a line of growth. The modern economist desires to study society in the same manner.

Lord Sherbrooke and others have claimed for political economy the power of prediction, and this has been based on the assumption that men will continue to act precisely as they have acted in time past. What seems to me a more truly scientific conception is this: the economist hopes to understand industrial society so thoroughly, that he may be able to indicate the general lines of future development. It follows from all this, that the future is something which proceeds from the present, and depends largely upon forces at work in the past.

More than this is true. The economic life of man is to some considerable extent the product of the human will. John Stuart Mill draws the line in this way: he says that production depends upon natural laws, while distribution "is matter of human institution solely." Both statements are somewhat exaggerated. The truth is, political economy occupies a position midway between physical or natural science and mental science. It is a combination of both. With the inventions and discoveries of modern times, we seem almost to have solved the problem of production: but the problem of an ideal distribution of products still awaits a satisfactory solution. But how largely does this depend on human will? Mill points to the institution of private property as fundamental in the distribution of goods. This is true, and the historical economist discovers that

the idea of property is something fluctuating. He ascertains that there was a time when landed property was mostly held in common; that in certain parts of the earth it is still held in that manner; while there are far-reaching variations in systems of land-tenure, even in England, France, and Germany, — all of them countries in about the same stage of economic development. Take changes in labor. The laborer has been a slave, a serf, and a freeman in various stages of economic development. His condition has been one of human institution, yet how largely fraught with consequences for the distribution of goods. One more illustration: take even railways. How differently would the wealth of the United States to-day be distributed, had we adopted an exclusive system of state railways in the beginning of railway construction, and adhered to that system!

The ethical school of economists aims, then, to direct in a certain definite manner, so far as may be, this economic, social growth of mankind. Economists who adhere to this school wish to ascertain the laws of progress, and to show men how to make use of them.

It has been said that recent tendencies in political economy indicate a return to Adam Smith; and as in philosophy the watchword, "Back to Kant," has come into vogue, it has been thought that political economists ought to find inspiration in the cry, "Back to Adam Smith!" While rec-

ognizing the truth which this implies, I am inclined to the opinion that in some respects the drift is back even to Plato. If you should attempt to develop a conception of political economy out of Plato's writings, would it not, when formulated, be about as follows: Political economy is the science which prescribes rules and regulations for such a production, distribution, and consumption of wealth as to render the citizens good and happy?[1] With this compare Laveleye's definition as found in his text-book: "Political economy may therefore be defined as the science which determines what laws men ought to adopt in order that they may, with the least possible exertion, procure the greatest abundance of things useful for the satisfaction of their wants; may distribute them justly, and consume them rationally."[2] Though exception may be taken to this definition as a rather too narrow conception of political economy, it answers very well the purposes of the present article, for it draws attention to the ethical side of the recent development of economics.

It is well to describe somewhat more in detail the ethical ideal which animates the new political economy. It is the most perfect development of all human faculties in each individual, which can

[1] See the writer's "Past and Present of Political Economy," p. 48.

[2] Taussig edition, New York, 1884, p. 3.

be attained. There are powers in every human being capable of cultivation; and each person, it may be said, accomplishes his end when these powers have attained the largest growth which is possible to them. This means anything rather than equality. It means the richest diversity, for differentiation accompanies development. It is simply the Christian doctrine of talents committed to men, all to be improved, whether the individual gift be one talent, two, five, or ten talents. The categorical imperative of duty enforces upon each rational being perfection "after his kind." Now, the economic life is the basis of this growth of all the higher faculties — faculties of love, of knowledge, of æsthetic perception, and the like, as exhibited in religion, art, language, literature, science, social and political life. What the political economist desires, then, is such a production and such a distribution of economic goods as must in the highest practicable degree subserve the end and purpose of human existence for all members of society.

This is different from the conception of life which is current in society, though it is in harmony with the ethical ideal of Christianity. The majority of the well-to-do tacitly assume that the masses are created to minister unto their pleasure, while this ethical ideal does not allow us to accept the notion that any one lives merely "to subserve another's gain." An illustration will make clear

this difference. Listen to two ladies discussing the education of the serving class, and you shall find that the arguments probably all turn upon the effect thereby produced upon them as servants. An incident which happened at a gathering of some kind of a ladies' church society tells us a great deal about our ordinary sentiments. The ladies were discussing the "servant-girl question," and one after another told her troubles. One of them, however, was silent until urged to tell them about her experiences. She said, "Really, I have no trouble with servants." "How is that?" all exclaimed. Finally she confessed that she made her servants a matter of prayer and asked that she might be taught her duty to them. "Your duty!" was the surprised exclamation; but a new light began to dawn on them. Some confessed that they had asked the Lord to send them good servants, but no one else had ever asked to know her duty to her servants.

As has already been stated, the demand of ethics is not equality. A large quantity of economic goods is required to furnish a satisfactory basis for the life of the naturally gifted. Books, travel, the enjoyment of works of art, a costly education, are a few of these things. Others lower in the scale of development will need fewer economic goods. One may be able to satisfy all rational needs for what can be purchased for three dollars a day, while another may

need four times that amount. Again: while it is probable that those who belong to the ethical school, as it is called, with Mill, look forward with satisfaction to a time when the condition of an ordinary servant will be held to be beneath members of civilized society, it is doubtless true that large numbers to-day, and for a long time to come, like, perhaps, the majority of our negroes, will find in the condition of servants in really superior families precisely the best possible opportunity for personal development which they are able to use; and it is possible that there will always be some unworthy of anything higher than a menial position.

The ethical view of economics rejects the communism of Babœuf as something not merely impracticable, but as something not at all desirable. On the other hand, social ethics will not allow us for one moment to accept the apparent ideal of Renan, when he calmly assures us, that, to such an extent do the many subserve the gain of the few, that forty millions may well be regarded as dung, do they but supply the fertility which will produce one truly great man. Like many others, including indeed representatives of high culture, he seems to regard human development as something existing altogether apart from individuals, as an end to be pursued in itself without regard to the condition of human beings as such.

It cannot well be argued that present society

satisfies, in so high a degree as one may rationally desire, the demands of ethics. On the one hand, we see those who are injured by a superfluity of economic goods; and, on the other, those who have not the material basis on which to build the best possible superstructure. In both cases this is waste of human power, or, we might say, waste of man.

It is desired in future so to guide and direct the forces which control the production and distribution of economic goods, that they may in the highest degree subserve the ends of humanity. It is not claimed that the power of man is unlimited, but it is maintained that it can and will accomplish great things.

Here we have at once a standard by which to test economic methods. Take the case of low wages. It is argued that low wages increase possible production. Even if this be so, such wages diminish the power of the recipients to participate in the advantages of existing civilization, and consequently defeat the end and purpose of all production. Child labor, female labor, and excessive hours of labor, fall under the same condemnation. In the language of Roscher, "the starting-point as well as the object-point of our science is man."

It has been said truthfully that the essential characteristic of the new political economy is the relation it endeavors to establish between ethics and economic life. A new conception of social

ethics is introduced into economics, and the standpoint is taken that there should be no divergence between the two. While representatives of an older view endeavor carefully to separate the two, the adherents of the ethical school attempt to bring them into the closest relation, — indeed, I may say, an inseparable relation. They apply ethical principles to economic facts and economic institutions, and test their value by that standard. Political economy is thus brought into harmony with the great religious, political, and social movements which characterize this age; for the essence of them all is the belief that there ought to be no contradiction between our actual economic life and the postulates of ethics and a determination that there shall be an abolition of such things as will not stand the tests of this rule. If industrial society as it exists at present does not answer this requirement, then industrial society stands condemned; or, in so far as it fails to meet this requirement, in so far is it condemned. It is not that it is hoped to reach a perfect ideal at one bound, but that the ideal is a goal for which men must strive. The new conception of the state is thus secondary, in the opinion of the adherents of the ethical school, to the new conception of social ethics. Doubtless there is a new conception of the state; for in this co-operative institution is discovered one of the means to be used to accomplish the end of human society, the ethical ideal. Per-

haps still more important is the departure of economists from the individualistic philosophy which characterized the era of the French Revolution, and which has gained such a stronghold in America, because our republic happened to be founded at a time when this view of individual sovereignty was in the ascendant. The philosophy of individualism came to us from England, which had been influenced by France, as well as directly from France, at a time when our thought was in a formative period, and was especially open to new ideas. But the ethical school, I think it safe to say, places society above the individual, because the whole is more than any of its parts; also because, as Aristotle says, "the whole includes all the parts, but the part does not include the whole." In time of war, society demands even the sacrifice of life; in time of peace, it is held right that individual sacrifices should be demanded for the good of others. The end and purpose of economic life are held to be the greatest good of the greatest number, or of society as a whole. This view is found distinctly expressed in Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," particularly in one place, where he says, "those exertions of the natural liberty of a few individuals, which may endanger the liberty of the whole society, are, and ought to be, restrained by the laws of all governments." This view, however, does not imply a conflict between the development of the individual and the

development of society. Self-development for the sake of others is the aim of social ethics. Self and others, the individual and society, are thus united in one purpose.

It is not possible to develop all these thoughts in a single essay, for that would indeed require a large book; nor can any attempt be made to offer anything like complete proof of the various propositions enunciated. It has been my purpose to describe briefly a line of thought which it seems to me characterizes what is called the new political economy; and it should be distinctly understood that this paper claims only to be descriptive and suggestive.

It may be well, in conclusion, to point out the fact that the ethical conception of political economy harmonizes with recent tendencies in ethics. The older ethical systems may, I think, be called individual. The perfection of the individual, or the worthiness of the individual, to use another expression, was the end proposed. Moral excellence of a single person was considered as something which might exist by itself, and need not bear any relation to one's fellows. Men were treated as units, and not as members of a body. The new tendency of which I speak, however, proceeds from the assumption that society is an organism, and that the individual is a part of a larger whole. Rudolph von Ihering develops this idea in the first two volumes of his *Zweck im Recht.*

The source of ethics he finds in society; the end of ethics likewise is discovered in society; and from society, according to this theory, is derived the ethical motive power which resides in the human will.[1] Social ethics thus replaces individual ethics. Ethics becomes one of the social sciences, and indeed, to use Ihering's expression, the "queen" of them all. With this view of Ihering, should be compared the teaching of Lotze; and I will close this paper with a quotation of some length from his "Practical Philosophy": "To antiquity, man appeared without any manifest attachment to a coherent system, transcending his earthly life, pre-eminently as a creature of nature, whose aim — not so much moral as altogether natural — could only consist in bringing all the bodily and spiritual capacities with which he is endowed by nature, to the most intensive, and at the same time harmonious, cultivation. . . . This whole culture is not a preparation of the powers for a work to be accomplished; but it is a self-aim to such an extent that the self-enjoyment of one's own fair personality, and its secure tenure against all attacks from without, form the sole content of such a life. . . . Just the opposite of this, under the influence of Christianity, the con-

[1] See work *Zweck im Recht.* A *résumé* of his arguments may be found in his article, "Die geschichtlich-gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen der Ethik," in *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung, und Volkswirthschaft*, for 1882.

viction is formed, that, strictly speaking, every man is called only to the service of others; that the effort to concentrate all possible excellences in one's own person is, at bottom, only a 'shining vice'; but true morality consists in the complete surrender of one's own self, and in self-sacrifice for others. . . . Nothing, therefore, remains for us to do but to supplement the ancient self-satisfaction, without surrendering æsthetic culture, by having all the powers acquired by such culture placed at command for the accomplishment of a life-aim in accordance with motions of benevolence;" and "benevolence, . . . the service of others, constitutes the focal point of ethical ideas."[1]

[1] See Lotze's "Practical Philosophy," Professor Ladd's edition, Boston, 1855, pp. 58–60.

V.

THE SOCIAL CRISIS AND THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY.

ADDRESS BY

RICHARD T. ELY,

Delivered at the Fifth Annual Convention of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, Philadelphia, Saturday, Oct. 18, 1890: also (with a few slight modifications), at the Convention of the Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor, Pittsburgh, Friday, Nov. 7, 1890.

THE SOCIAL CRISIS AND THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY.

THE SOCIAL CRISIS OUTLINED AND CHARACTERIZED.

You all are familiar with these well-known lines from Shakespeare:

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

This tide in the affairs of men is what we mean by a crisis. A crisis is a great turning-point, from which we may proceed to fortune or to ruin. There are individual and also social crises. Human history records many remarkable crises in the life of society and of nations. The Church has also had her crises. The era of the Protestant Reformation was a great social, religious, and national crisis. The words and deeds of remarkable men at that time have exercised a potent influence upon the thought and action of subsequent ages; for a period of crisis is an unusually plastic period. The latter part of the last century witnessed most momentous crises in the world's history. Our

Declaration of Independence and our Revolutionary War constituted a crisis which can hardly be overestimated, — the full import of which, indeed, is as yet but dimly apprehended. The French Revolution a little later was one of these world events which are powerfully moulding history, and which will continue to mould it, for centuries. When we look through American history from the time of the formation of our federal Constitution to the present, we find frequent turning-points, which, although of lesser import, are still genuine crises. All important social movements have their crises, and the year 1886 witnessed a crisis in the labor movement. It reached a height heretofore unknown among us, and a great opportunity was then offered for beneficent change and progress. But adequate preparation had not been made for this crisis. Its meaning was not fully understood by the leaders of the labor movement, and the right kind of men did not come forward for leadership. Sad is it to contemplate all the wasted social energy, the frustrated hopes, the heart-burnings of that year.

The year 1886, however, constituted but a comparatively little crisis, which itself is a part of a greater crisis. It is believed by careful observers in all the leading civilized nations that this last quarter of the nineteenth century is a period of one of the greatest social crises in the world's history. It has been truly observed that "great economic

and social forces flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half conscious of that which is befalling them." While there can be no doubt about this, it is equally true that, in looking back over past history, we often find at least an imperfect consciousness of the true nature of existing crises on the part of wise and good men.

What are the characteristics of the present social crisis? I suppose the chief characteristic of all is a deep stirring of the masses, not a local stirring, not merely a national stirring, but an international, world-wide stirring of the masses. The aim of this movement is a profound social reconstruction. What is desired is change, not merely in surface phenomena, but in the foundations of the social order. Those institutions which lie at the very basis of social life, and which give shape and direction to this life, are called in question. Perhaps, when the full import of this is understood, it may be a sober judgment — and not a rash exaggeration — to say that it is the most important, the farthest and deepest reaching crisis known to human history. Let us examine very briefly a few features of the present social crisis.

It is, among other things, economic in its nature. It is concerned with material good things, or, as we often say, with wealth. The manner of production of these material good things is examined critically and pronounced faulty. The distribution of these good things among the various mem-

bers of the social organism is likewise critically examined, and is pronounced iniquitous. Proposals are made for new modes of production and distribution of economic goods. Sometimes these economic discussions reveal a degrading materialism, but at other times a lofty idealism and determination to make the material side of life subordinate to the highest social ends. Recent historical researches have shown how fundamental are our economic relations. The progress in historical studies during the present generation has largely been due to a better appreciation of the influence of ordinary economic institutions and habits upon every department of social life, — art, religion, literature, all included. However spiritual a man may be, it is necessary for him first of all to secure an economic basis for his activity, if he is to do even the noblest work in the world. I call attention to these considerations because I wish you to grasp the full significance of the fact that our present social crisis is largely economic in character, and not to turn away from it as unworthy the consideration of the deepest intellects and the most exalted characters.

Another feature of the social crisis is its world-wide reach. This has already been mentioned, but we must call to mind a few particulars. One is the organization of labor, — once merely local, then at a later period national, and now international and cosmopolitan. About a generation ago

labor organizations began to adopt the word "international" as part of their title, and such they have become with ever-increasing extent from that time to the present day. Those who are influential in the organization of labor, including even many ordinary artisans and mechanics, embrace a tremendously wide sweep in their vision. Events of importance to wage-earners in any one part of the world are known very soon in every other part of the world. In the office of the editor of a labor paper you will see among his exchanges labor newspapers not merely from every European country, but from Asia, Africa, and Australia. You will find newspapers devoted to the interests of labor, printed in at least three different languages, part of the paper in one, part in a second, and another part in still a third. I call to mind one labor paper printed partly in English, partly in German, and partly in Bohemian. I remember another paper which used principally English, but sometimes printed French articles. Not only are intelligent workingmen aware of events in other lands which concern them, but day by day to an increasing extent they act in concert. Workingmen in Belgium learn of a strike in England, and refuse to accept offers of employment in that country. They come to this country for employment, and when they find that they are expected to take the place of strikers, they return to Belgium with money furnished by

their American fellows. A great strike of dock laborers in London breaks out, and is carried to successful completion with the aid of contributions received from Australian workingmen, living on the other side of the globe. Simultaneously on the first of May workingmen parade, make speeches, and otherwise participate in a demonstration for an eight-hour working day in the United States, in France, Germany, Spain, and elsewhere. In our American Pittsburgh, representatives of six nations met a few years since and formed a union of glass-workers designed to embrace every one engaged in that industry on the entire surface of the globe. The last issue of the *North American Review* contains an article on labor movements in Great Britain by Michael Davitt, in which he states that our American organization, the Knights of Labor, is rapidly spreading in Great Britain and Ireland. We have already heard of assemblies of Knights of Labor in Belgium and Australia, and the General Master Workman of them all is Mr. Powderly. Our own country, also, issues an invitation to organized workingmen everywhere to hold a world's congress of labor in Chicago in the year 1893. The circular, which proceeds from the American Federation of Labor, begins as follows: "Wage-workers of all countries! Comrades, — recognizing the identity of interests of the wage-workers of the world, the great bond of interest and sym-

pathy which should prevail in the hearts and minds of all toilers," and then proceeds to announce the labor congress to be held at the time of the World's Fair. The object of holding the congress is stated to be "to formulate and discuss the very many questions affecting our interests, to give a greater impetus to the cause of progress and civilization, and to make known to the world by our unalterable determination that we insist upon being larger sharers in the world's progress." Truly, these facts which I have cited, and to which I might add many more similar in nature, lend dignity to the labor movement, whatever else they may indicate.

We have, on the other hand, an organization of capital which embraces within the scope of its activity many nations, and even the idea of an exclusive world combination of capitalists is becoming familiar to us in the proposed world trusts. These organizations mean — it is useless to disguise it — conflict, deep and prolonged. Even if happily it does not mean a conflict at arms, it does mean a conflict none the less real, and perhaps at times scarcely less disastrous. It is all very well to say that capital and labor are allies and not enemies, but the phrase, if it means anything, is but a pious aspiration. The interests of nations, we may as well say, are harmonious and not diverse, but nations from time to time in the world's history have gone to war, and in

all probability will continue to do so for an indefinite period.

Fortunately there is coupled with the desire for radical change a pronounced longing for domestic and international peace, and together with the words "strike" and "combination" we see joined the words "arbitration" and "conciliation." One of these organizations mentioned, namely, the Knights of Labor, has from the very beginning placed among its aims, not merely the assertion of the rights of wage-earners, but plans for arbitration and for the ultimate harmonious co-operation of all social and economic factors. Consistently with this the Knights of Labor have always been willing to admit to their ranks employers as well as employés, and have gladly welcomed the professional classes, so that we find among them at least some considerable employers and men of means, as well as teachers, preachers, physicians, writers for the press, and authors.

Labor organizations, however, are only one of the characteristic features of the present social crisis. We have many other features; anarchy, of both a violent revolutionary and a peaceable type. The International Workmen's Association, including the Chicago anarchists, is, however, our best-known representative of anarchy. Wherever found, anarchy is cosmopolitan in feeling. We have the opposite of anarchy, socialism, the extension of which over the face of the earth has been one of

the most remarkable social movements of modern times. It is as yet scarcely a generation since a well-known French historian of social movements penned the obituary of socialism, but penned its obituary, as we now see, before it was scarcely born. The ink was hardly dry on this obituary notice before socialism again reared its head, and now it has become a power felt in every civilized nation the world over without an exception. We have in this country the American type of socialism, the new Nationalism, which has made so much noise in the world and has spread so rapidly that it is difficult to realize that the first Nationalists' Club has not yet held its second anniversary. We have also the movement instituted by Henry George, designed to modify a fundamental economic institution, private property in land, and Henry George's name within ten years has become a household word in America, Europe, and Australia, and is not unknown in Asia and Africa.

It is sometimes foolishly asserted by ignorant people that these social and economic movements are not American, but essentially foreign. This is absurd. They are, as pointed out, cosmopolitan, and not national at all, and take them all together it may be doubted whether any country has contributed so much to these social movements as the United States. From every land the wage-earning classes are looking to America for inspiration and direction.

Another feature of the social crisis is the religious restlessness of the time. Even the oldest historical churches have felt this influence and are undergoing change. Religion is a social tie; it unites men; it is a necessary element in the social organism if its members are to work harmoniously together, and in our estimate of the true import of the social crisis we must not fail to inquire into religious movements.

What is the character of these new forces which are revolutionary? Do they promise peaceful revolution, or one of violence and bloodshed, a beneficent or a maleficent revolution? That depends upon their religious character. These forces may be guided by a religious spirit, or they may be directed by a spirit of irreligious materialism. If Christ, the head of the Church, guides these forces, all will be well. Happily some earnest Christian men are engaged in these tremendous social movements, and are using all their power to direct them into proper channels. Would that there were more of these Christian men bringing their influence to bear upon these social movements! But there are in these movements those who are vicious, as well as those who misunderstand the nature of Christianity, and identify it with abuse of Christianity. We find un-Christian and anti-Christian elements in these social movements. We discover those who are simply indifferent to the claims of Christianity; absorbed by other forces, they pay little

heed to it. We find also a man like the Italian patriot, Mazzini, a noble character, rejecting Christianity because he thought it taught men the selfish pursuit of individual salvation to the exclusion of social welfare. We find men like Mr. Frederic Harrison, the London Positivist, who contrasts the professions of Christians with their practice, and turns away from Christianity with pathetic words — words not devoid of a noble ring. "In a healthy state of things," says Mr. Harrison, "and if Christianity were equal to its proud professions, it would be the business of the great white races of Europe to raise the standard of civilization through Asia, and ultimately through Africa. But what was seen at the present day in Africa," he said, "was the great lust of conquest, of trade gains, of lands to be won by fighting, and profits to be snatched by fraud, strength, wealth, and chicanery. . . . Christianity as the morality of nations has visibly failed. Socially regarded, it did almost nothing to control the state of expectant war and the jealousy of nations. . . . The power of Christianity for the moral life of the individual was one which Positivism has always recognized; but the power of Christianity for the intellectual, scientific, or political life of nations in a revolutionary age, or for the industrial life of the present generation, was a problem of the day. It was there that Christianity not only failed, but was criminally complacent to the evils." We find

among the elements of these social movements a spirit of resistance to Christianity, passing into open attack, culminating in the revilings of men like the Chicago anarchists and John Most, who say the Church is bad, thoroughly bad, a bulwark of privilege, in Europe of dynasties, here of plutocrats. "Heaven," says one writer of this class, "is a dream invented by robbers to distract the attention of the victims of their brigandage." An article in Most's paper, the *Freiheit*, concludes with the exclamation: "Religion, authority, and state are all carved out of the same piece of wood. To the devil with them all!" And the Pittsburgh manifesto of the International Working People's Association contains this sentence: "The Church finally seeks to make complete idiots out of the masses, and to make them forego the paradise on earth by promising them a fictitious heaven." A man like Colonel Robert Ingersoll comes forward as the champion of oppressed humanity, and to many becomes a hero. Have we not in what has been said given some indications of a very real and very awful crisis? These forces which are outlined are not altogether condemned — far from it — but it is maintained that they indicate a present social crisis, the like of which may be difficult for any man to point out in human history.

THE SOCIAL CRISIS AN OPPORTUNITY.

Dr. Josiah Strong, the author of the well-known book "Our Country," once said, in an address to which I had the pleasure of listening, that he would rather live in the last half of the nineteenth century than in any previous period of the world's history. He intimated, if he did not say it in so many words, that he considered his position as a disciple of Christ in this age preferable to that of one of Christ's own immediate followers in his lifetime upon earth. The reason why he could make such a statement becomes obvious on a little reflection. Dr. Strong is fully conscious of the existence of an extraordinary social crisis, and he feels that our opportunities at present are in proportion to the gravity of the crisis. There is no doubt about this. A crisis means an opportunity, and the present social crisis is the Church's unprecedented, unparalleled opportunity. The Church cannot stand athwart the path of progress and prevent the onward movement of the mighty social forces which are sweeping over us. Any attempt to stop these forces is reckless madness. The Church may, however, direct these forces into such fruitful channels that they may become powerful for the good of man and the glory of God.

The Church must gain leadership, and what does that mean? Not that clergymen as such, perhaps

not at all, should be recognized as pre-eminently social leaders of the time, but that the spirit of Christ should be infused into the social movement under consideration, and that the social forces which are producing this upheaval of the world should become mighty ethical forces. It is said that the Church must gain leadership, and how? This question may be answered by asking and answering other questions. How does it happen that the Church has lost a leadership which she once possessed? How does it happen that as a matter of fact the present social crisis has come upon her almost unawares, and that she is not prepared to meet it? The trouble is that she has in recent centuries to a large extent been preaching a one-sided half-gospel, and not a whole gospel. The remedy is a strong masculine gospel, and not merely a feminine gospel; in other words, a whole gospel. What we need is the whole truth, and that includes a social as well as an individual gospel.

While avoiding destructive criticism, let us examine ourselves honestly and encourage constructive criticism. It is as a sincere friend of the Church, a believer in the Church, a member of the Church, that I come before you and criticise the narrow, negative, individualistic attitude of Protestantism. It is because one-half of the gospel has been neglected that a lot of phrases like "saving souls" — many of them unscriptural — have come to represent the whole of the gospel

to the minds of many. The Church's opportunity, then, is to turn away from a negative, narrow, individualistic Protestantism, and to proclaim the broad catholicity of Christian truth and policy. In metaphysics we hear cries like these — Back to Kant!" "Back to Plato!" Let us in the Church raise the cry — Back to Christ! not, however, in any fanatical spirit. God reveals Himself in nature, in history, in social life, in His Church and in the State, but the greatest revelation of all is in Christ. The Bible contains the fullest account of this revelation, and it is this revelation of Christ that helps us to understand all the other manifestations of God in His world. The same thought may be expressed in other words, namely — "Forward to Christ," indicating that, if we look to Christ for an ideal and an inspiration, we do not mean to return to antiquated institutions, but to press forward to a nobler future than any past age. If any think "Back to Christ" means reaction, we will add the cry "Forward to Christ."

The gospel of Christ is both individual and social. It proclaims individual and social regeneration, individual and social salvation. Yet to such an extent has half of the gospel been neglected that the very phrase "social Christianity" strikes some as strange. Let us contrast the kind of gospel I have described as only half-gospel with the gospel of the Bible. In a previous address

delivered elsewhere I called attention to modern hymns. While many of them are undoubtedly grand, yet taken as a whole they contain in their exclusive individualism an unanswerable indictment of the life of the Church. I would emphasize this point, because the hymns of the Church must of necessity reveal the true inward life of the Church, just as the life of a nation is revealed by its songs. The narrow character of the hymns of the Church has been brought home to me forcibly of late, because when preaching a few lay sermons in which I have endeavored to bring out the social content of Christianity, I have in vain searched for hymns suitable for the occasion. It is difficult to find a hymn in our hymnal which is not individualistic, while many of them reveal an unhealthy introspection and positive selfishness. You may open the hymn-book at random, and see if this is not true. In preparing this discourse I took up a copy of our hymnal, and on opening it the first hymn that I saw was that which begins with this stanza: —

"Whate'er my God ordains is right;
His will is ever just;
Howe'er He orders now my case,
I will be still and trust.
He is my God;
Though dark my road,
He holds me that I shall not fall,
Wherefore to Him I leave it all."

And the last stanza reads as follows: —

"Whate'er my God ordains is right;
Here will I take my stand,
Though sorrow, need, or death make earth
For me a desert land,
My Father's care
Is round me there,
He holds me that I shall not fall;
And so to Him I leave it all."

This hymn, which is a fair sample of the vast majority of modern hymns, is perhaps good enough so far as it goes, but it is a very serious fault that the hymns we have stop where they do.

I take my Bible and let it fall open where it will in the Psalms, and the first psalm that I see is number 68. It begins: —

"*Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered: let them also that hate Him flee before Him.*

"*As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish at the presence of God.*

"*But let the righteous be glad; let them rejoice before God: yea, let them exceedingly rejoice.*

"*Sing unto God, sing praises to His name: extol Him that rideth upon the heavens by His name JAH, and rejoice before Him.*

"*A father of the fatherless and a judge of the widows, is God in His holy habitation.*

"*God setteth the solitary in families: He bringeth*

out those which are bound with chains: but the rebellious dwell in a dry land."

The entire psalm is social and national, and it does not contain an *I* or *me* except when the words are put into the mouth of the Lord. Many of the psalms, it is true, do contain the individual element, and are an unspeakable comfort and help to the individual as such in times of sorrow and distress. The very next psalm, for example, begins: —

"*Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul.*

"*I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.*

"*I am weary of my crying: my throat is dried: mine eyes fail while I wait for my God.*"

But before the Psalmist has finished he remembers that he is one among many, that he is a member of a social and national organism, that he is an individual with brothers, and he turns from himself and sings: —

"*The Lord heareth the poor and despiseth not his prisoners.*

* * * * * * *

"*For God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah: that they may dwell there and have it in possession.*

"*The seed also of His servants shall inherit it: and they that love His name shall dwell therein.*"

It is a glory of the Psalms that you always find these two elements so beautifully blended. Their content is both individual and social, feminine and masculine. There are other songs in the Bible which are equally instructive in this connection. I have in mind the songs recorded in the Gospel according to St. Luke connected with the birth of Christ, and I beg you to notice the marked and painful contrast with the generality of modern hymns. We have first the song of Mary, the mother of Christ: —

"*My soul doth magnify the Lord,*

"*And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.*

"*For He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.*

"*For He that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is His name.*

"*And His mercy is on them that fear Him from generation to generation.*

"*He hath showed strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.*

"*He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree.*

"*He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent hungry away.*

"*He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy;*

"*As He spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to His seed forever.*"

The next song is that of Zacharias, who, filled with the Holy Ghost, prophesied, saying: —

"*Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for He hath visited and redeemed His people,*

"*And raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David;*"

and the song concludes in these words: —

"*And thou, child, shall be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways;*

"*To give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their Sins,*

"*Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us,*

"*To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.*"

Next follows the song of the angels. And the angel said unto the shepherds watching over their flocks: —

"*Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.*

"*For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.*"

And after this announcement,

"*Suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,*

"*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.*"

We would do well to ponder the subordination of the individualistic element to the social in these songs. Surely its deep significance may teach us that God's way for us to save ourselves is humbly in His fear to work diligently for the salvation of individuals and nations in this world; in other words, for the coming to pass of that kingdom which filled the mind and heart of Christ. When we read our Bible thoughtfully, we must be struck by the grand, sublime, all-inclusive generalizations which include the whole duty of man within the compass of a few words, but also with their minute and detailed practical application to the affairs of life. We find this in the Psalms; we find such homely subjects mentioned as interest on money, as weights and measures, as righteous judgment, as merciful consideration of the need of the poor. Beyond controversy there runs all through the Bible as a distinct aim of God's purpose for Israel the abolition of poverty, and the establishment of general social welfare. This is not all, it is true, but it is a prominent part; and this is a part of the law of God which Christ came to fulfil. It was the ceremonial law merely and not the social law which Christ abolished. The spirit of the entire social law of the Old Testament is as binding upon us as upon any member of the Jewish commonwealth.

You all remember one of the early sermons of Christ in which He proclaimed His mission : —

"*The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.*" [1]

Thus Christ proclaimed His mission of social as well as individual salvation, and announced that He was anointed to establish here among us a kingdom of God. You will also remember how

[1] The acceptable year of the Lord was a reference to that great social and economic institution, the year of Jubilee. An old commentator says: "This was a year of general release of debts and obligations; of bond- men and women; of lands and possessions, which had been sold from the families and tribes to which they had belonged." There is controversy about some points, and it is not clear that there was a remission of all debts. It is, however, indisputable that it was an anti-poverty measure. The avowed design was that there should be no poor in Israel. It is forced and unnatural to make Christ refer *merely* to deliverance from spiritual poverty and to the healing *merely* of inward spiritual disease. Such an interpretation is contradicted by the gospel accounts of his life. No one who heard Christ imagined that he promised *merely* inward, individualistic blessing. As Christ expounded the Scriptures, "*all bare Him witness and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth.*"

It ought scarcely to be necessary to warn against an opposite error to that against which I contend. Christ did not promise merely or even chiefly material blessings. He always taught the subordination of the material to the spiritual, and that is the aim of the true kind of social reform.

unsparingly Christ condemned the cruelty and oppression of His day, and how He mentioned definite, concrete forms of sin, —

"*Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.*"

I think most of us do not understand the kind of social sermons that Christ preached. If, however, any one will take the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and will translate it into modern language, substituting for the sins there denounced the chief sins of our day, and for the influential persons there named those classes which are most prominent in our society, — as for scribes and Pharisees, railway magnates, coal barons, University professors and doctors of divinity, I think he will come to understand better than before one reason at least why Christ was crucified. A man who would talk as Christ did on the streets of Chicago or New York would be in danger of being clubbed by the police, if nothing worse. I am not saying that we should imitate this language, but I am simply trying to point out to you its nature. If we read the writings of Christ's apostles, we shall find likewise mention of specific evils of the day and unsparing denunciation of them. Keeping back the hire of the laborers was a social evil in the time of St. James as at the present day, and St. James did not hesi-

tate to bid the rich men who kept back the hire of the laborers to weep and howl for the miseries which should come upon them. Perhaps had he lived in our day, he would have had something to say about weekly pay-bills and powerful corporations which resisted them, and he might have used equally plain and vigorous language.

We see, then, how the Church could not be ready for the movements of our time. These are distinctively social, and her social armor she has allowed to rust. She has attempted to answer the question, "What must I do to be saved?" but she has not been equally clear and explicit in her answers to questions like these — How must I relieve the oppressed? How must I help the fatherless? How must I overthrow the machinations of those who in our own day make long prayers for pretence and devour widows' houses? What must the American people do to be saved? What must I do to help work out the salvation of the American people? As soon as we grasp this thought of the social character as well as the individual character of Christianity, we find every page of the Scriptures illuminated with a new light. We find, for example, that when Christ said, Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all earthly good things shall be added unto you, He was proclaiming a truth rather of social and national application than of individual application. Material good things are by no means always

added to the individual seeker of God's kingdom, and Christ again and again distinctly said that His followers must often give up all these material goods. These material good things were not added unto Christ, who surely first of all sought God's kingdom, nor were they added unto His immediate followers. But it is true to-day, as in the time of Christ and in all times, that that nation which in all its laws and institutions seeks first the kingdom of God shall have all these things added unto it.

New significance can also be attached to institutions like the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Its individual character, which is usually exclusively dwelt upon, is only one part of its significance. What is its social significance? It is fraternity; brothers and sisters in Christ partake of a common meal, and from most ancient times this has been regarded as symbolic of brotherhood and also as promotive of brotherhood.[1] To this day German students enter into a new relation with each other by drinking together what they call "Brotherhood" (Bruderschaft). After drinking this together, they no longer call each other "you," but by the familiar appellation "thou."

As soon as the Church studies carefully and

[1] This gives peculiar significance to the invitation to come to the Holy Communion. "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors," etc.

begins to understand the fulness of the gospel message, an abundance of concrete social topics will be found suitable for discussion in the pulpit. I have recently been reading two interesting books, one called "Social Christianity," the other "The Philanthropy of God," containing sermons preached by a well-known English Methodist minister, Mr. Hugh Price Hughes. Mr. Hughes acknowledges that in his earlier ministry he preached narrow, one-sided individualism, but in these books he discusses topics like these: "The Administration of Justice," "Jesus Christ and the Masses," "Jesus Christ and Social Distress," "Christ the Greatest of Social Reformers," "National Character Determined by National Laws," "The Brotherliness of Christ," "Gambling," "International Arbitration," "The Problem of London Pauperism." In one of his sermons he mentions these nine social evils against which we must wage war: pauperism, ignorance, drunkenness, lust, gambling, slavery, Mammonism, war, and physical disease. In treating of the last evil he mentions six requisites of public health. These are: 1st, sanitary houses; 2d, fresh air; 3d, warm clothes; 4th, pure water; 5th, wholesome food; 6th, vigorous exercise. You see how wide the field opened by the discussion of such topics from a religious standpoint.

My Friends and Brothers, — I rejoice in the growth and prosperity of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, which in its programme has given so large a place to practical Christianity. Your growth and prosperity are the indications of our need of an organization like yours. You are helping the Church to understand the two sides of the Christian gospel, the individual and the social. Continue in your good work, and hasten that day of triumph when Christ shall be the recognized leader of all great social movements, and when Christians, realizing as never before the fulness and completeness of the individual and social salvation of Christ, shall attain a new conception of the abundant and all-sufficient love of God revealed to us in His son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, and shall understand better than before why Paul concluded his wonderful thirteenth chapter of Corinthians with these words, —

"*And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.*"

3,444

SOCIALISM. An Examination of its Nature, its Strength and its Weakness, with Suggestions for SOCIAL REFORM.

Part I., The Nature of Socialism. Part II., The Strength of Socialism. Part III., The Weakness of Socialism. Part IV., The Golden Mean, or Practicable Social Reform. By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science, and History in the University of Wisconsin. Vol. 3 in Crowell's Library of Economics. One vol. xiii + 449 pp. 11 Appendices; Bibliography; Index. Cloth, $1.50.

Dr. Ely's impartial and critical treatment of the strength and weakness of Socialism may be regarded as the best presentation of this subject that has yet appeared. He is fair-minded and candid enough to recognize the saving principles of the system, and yet fearlessly points out its dangers and defects.

Numerous appendices, containing the programs and platforms of various socialistic bodies and the best and most exhaustive bibliography to be found in any language, add greatly to the value of this volume, which will be found indispensable to students of sociology, and of great value to the general public.

"On the whole, this may be regarded as the *most notable book of the year*, whether we look at it as a stimulus to thought, or a contribution to the discussion of a subject which is every day forcing itself more and more upon the attention of the public. The intelligent man of to-day must get some definite ideas of what Socialism is, what its strength is, as well as what its weakness is, and what the golden mean is. These definite ideas are what Professor Ely has put into a nutshell for us in this book. In doing so he has at the same time sustained his own high reputation as a writer, and conferred a substantial benefit upon the public." — *Prof. Jerome H. Raymond.*

"*Professor Ely's book is extraordinarily meaty.* It shows a very thorough knowledge of the literature of the subject, and of many of the contemporary phases of the movement. However one might be inclined to differ from the conclusions drawn, the strength and logic of the author's position will be acknowledged. One of the most admirable things about the work is its broad, humane sympathy, and its exposition of ethical motives as ranking among the most powerful economic factors." — *Boston Herald.*

"Dr. Ely is a close student, a vigorous thinker, and is determinedly fair and just in his conclusions. This volume, which is the third in Crowell's Library of Economics, is a strong one, and will take high rank among the books of the year." — *Boston Advertiser.*

"*Here for the first time the public is presented with a full and accurate account of Socialism* as it is — its nature, its philosophy, its history, and its literature, with a lucid analysis of its strength and its weaknesses — from the standpoint of one who is neither advocate nor opponent, but is an impartial and unprejudiced investigator. Nothing is extenuated, and naught set down in malice." — *Chicago Times.*

"A book for thoughtful men of to-day to read and ponder, in preparation for the serious work of to-morrow." — *Review of Reviews.*

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid by the publishers upon receipt of price.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO., PUBLISHERS,

Library of Economics and Politics.

Independent Treasury System of the United States.
By DAVID KINLEY, A.B. 12mo. $1.50

Repudiation of State Debts in the United States.
By WILLIAM A. SCOTT, Ph.D. 12mo. 1.50

Socialism and Social Reform.
By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., LL.D. 12mo. 1.50

American Charities.
By AMOS G. WARNER, Ph.D., Professor of Economics in the Leland Stanford, Jr., University. 12mo. 1.75

Hull-House Maps and Papers. A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago. With Maps. 8vo. 2.50
Special Edition, with Maps mounted on Linen. 8vo. . . . 3.50

Punishment and Reformation.
By F. H. WINES, LL.D. 12mo. 1.75

Social Theory. A Grouping of Social Facts and Principles. By JOHN BASCOM, Professor of Political Economy in Williams College. 12mo. 1.75

Proportional Representation.
By JOHN R. COMMONS, Professor of Sociology in Syracuse University. 12mo. 1.75

State Railroad Control.
By FRANK H. DIXON, Ph.D. 12mo. 1.75

Southern Side Lights.
By EDWARD INGLE, A.B. 12mo. Cloth. 1.75

Taxation and Taxes in the United States under the Internal Revenue System. By FREDERIC C. HOWE, A.M., Ph.D. 12mo. 1.75

An Essay on the Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States. By CHARLES B. SPAHR, Ph.D. 12mo. 1.50

Southern Statesmen of the Old Régime.
By WM. P. TRENT, A.M. 12mo. Gilt top, with portraits. . . 2.00

Workingmen's Insurance.
By W. F. WILLOUGHBY, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C. 12mo. 1.75

Congressional Committees.
By LAUROS G. McCONACHIE, A.M. 12mo. 1.75

Municipal Monopolies.
Edited by PROF. E. W. BEMIS. 12mo. 2.00

DATE DUE

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HN31.E59 1889
Ely, Richard Social aspects of Christia
3 0645 0005 7272 3